

Religious Education

The Journal of The Religious Education Association

(Copyright, 1924, by the Religious Education Association)

VOL. XIX

FEBRUARY, 1924

No. 1

CONTENTS

THE TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION	2
FAMILY LIFE IDEALS IN TRADITIONAL JUDAISM AND TODAY	5
<i>Abraham Cronbach</i>	
SOME LATER BOOKS BEARING ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND THE FAMILY	15
<i>Mary E. Moxcey</i>	
CHANGES IN THE FARM FAMILY	22
<i>Dwight Sanderson</i>	
THE ISOLATED FAMILY	32
<i>E. H. Sutherland</i>	
COOPERATION BETWEEN THE HOME AND THE SCHOOL	36
<i>Raymond A. Kent</i>	
AN UNSECTARIAN RELIGION FOR OUR SCHOOLS	39
<i>Ella Lyman Cabot</i>	
THE PROBLEM AND THE OPPORTUNITY OF EDUCATING THE NEAR EAST ORPHANS	45
<i>John Ralph Voris</i>	
THE CHRISTIAN IDEAL OF FAMILY LIFE AS EXPOUNDED IN HORACE BUSHNELL'S "CHRISTIAN NURTURE"	47
<i>Luther A. Weigle</i>	
HENRY NEUMANN'S "EDUCATION FOR MORAL GROWTH"	58
<i>George A. Coe</i>	

The writers alone are responsible for opinions expressed in this Journal; the Association affords an open forum with entire freedom and without official endorsements of any sort.

The Twenty-First Annual Convention

PROVIDENCE, APRIL 23-26, 1924

The General Committee was charged by the Convention of 1923 with the preparation of a program for the Convention of 1924 on the subject of "Religious Education and the Family." A survey of Religious Education in the Family was made by Prof. Clyde W. Votaw for the Association in 1911. The subject has been under constant consideration by one of the Departments of the Association. Its increasing significance under modern conditions led the convention of last year to feel that it should have thorough discussion.

The General Committee appointed a Program Committee consisting of: Prof. John E. Stout, Chairman; Miss Adelaide T. Case; Prof. E. M. Best, together with the officers of the General Committee. The Acting General Secretary and the Acting Editor have cooperated in the plans.

The Convention will be of the conference type. The experience of the last few years has seemed to demonstrate the value of printing careful, scholarly discussions in the magazine in advance as the basis for conference. The convention is thus freed from listening to extended papers, and has the opportunity for vigorous discussion of the topic from the floor.

The general plan is to consider first the types of families and their opportunity of religious development. With this as a background there can be discussion of the function of the family in the various phases of religious education. The program is not yet complete, but is here printed as far as the details have been settled.

For the first time since 1906 the Convention will meet without the inspiring and forceful presence of Dr. Henry Frederick Cope. He will be greatly missed. On Friday afternoon, at 4:45, there will be a simple service in his memory.

ADVANCE PROGRAM OF THE CONVENTION

PROVIDENCE, APRIL 23-26, 1924

Sessions in the Ball Room, Hotel Biltmore

THEME: "RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND THE FAMILY"

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 23

10:00 A. M.

Association of Directors and Ministers of Religious Education and
Department of Church Schools

"Training and Standards for Teachers"

"The Present Situation and Its Needs"

Teachers and Workers in Week-Day Religious Schools

"How Character Development is Actually Secured"

"Theories of Curriculum Building"

3:00 P. M.

"What Standards Shall we Have for Teachers of Religion"

2:00 P. M.

Teachers and Workers in Week-Day Religious Schools

"Subjective Contents of Curricula"

"Principles of Method in Teaching"

8:00 P. M.—FIRST SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE

President's Annual Address: "The Opportunity of the Family in the Development of Democracy"

THURSDAY, APRIL 24

Pre-printed paper: "Types of Families and Their Opportunities for Religious Development," Dr. Arthur E. Holt, Boston

9:00 A. M.—SECOND SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE

Discussion, "How Can the Family be more Fundamentally Democratized"

10:30 A. M.—THIRD SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE

"Economic Cooperation in the Family"

Ellis M. Studebaker, President LaVerne College, LaVerne, Calif.

Discussion.

2:00 P. M.—FOURTH SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE

"What is Actually Being Done in the Religious Education of Children in the Family"

A Study of Present Conditions, Mrs. Irene Mason Harper, Metuchen, N. J., Prof. D. L. Ritchie, Congregational Theological College, Montreal, Que., Canada

In Rural Communities, Rev. James Clarke, Hallville, P. O., Ontario, Canada

In Urban Communities, Rev. C. M. Wright, Bloor St. Presbyterian Church, Toronto, Ont., Canada

3:30 P. M.—FIFTH SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE

"Family Case Work in its Relation to Religious Education"

Suggested Topics for Discussion:

Divorce

The Place of the Woman in the Home

The "Single Standard" of Sex Morality

8:00 P. M.—SIXTH SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE

"What are the Higher Values upon which Families can Unite Their Interests," Mrs. Richard C. Cabot, Cambridge, Mass.

"The Place of the Family in the Integration of Educational Efforts"

Rev. Orville A. Petty, D.D., New Haven, Conn.

FRIDAY, APRIL 25

9:00 A. M.—SEVENTH SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE

"The Cooperation of the Family and the School"

Raymond A. Kent, Dean, College Liberal Arts, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

John E. Stout, Prof. Administration in Religious Education, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

"Inter-Action of Week-Day Schools and the Family"

Frank M. McKibben, County Director Religious Education, South Bend, Ind.

"Cooperation of the Family and Vacation Church Schools"

Helen E. Mummery, School of Religious Education, Boston University, Boston

Discussion

2:00 P. M.—EIGHTH SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE

“Cooperation of the Family and the Church”

Fred L. Brownlee, New York City

Miss Edna Dean Baker, Pres. National Kindergarten and Elementary College, Chicago

Mrs. B. S. Winchester, Fairfield, Conn.

Discussion

3:30 P. M.—NINTH SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE

“Family Life as an Objective of Higher Education”

Mrs. Eugenia Leonard, New York City

Pres. Irving A. Maurer, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.

Discussion

4:45 P. M.—TENTH SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE

In Memoriam Dr. Henry Frederick Cope

8:00 P. M.—ELEVENTH SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE

Held in connection with Brown University

Addresses on “The Youth Movement and the Family”

SATURDAY, APRIL 26

9:00 A. M.—TWELFTH SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE

“The Enrichment of Family Life”

Dr. L. W. Crawford, Professor of Religious Education, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.

“New Social Ideals in Family Life”

Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer, New York City

**10:30 A. M.—The Annual Meeting of The Religious Education Association
Action on “Statement of Findings”**

Business Meeting

Election of Officers

Meetings of the General Committee and of the Departments will be announced later.

Family Life Ideals in Traditional Judaism and Today

ABRAHAM CRONBACH, D.D.*

It hardly requires mention that the channel through which the Jewish people have exerted their greatest influence upon non-Jewish groups has been the Hebrew Scriptures. Increasing persecution and isolation after the downfall of the Jewish state prevented the emanation of any equally pronounced influence from one group upon the other by any other path. If present day Jewish ideals of home life are largely in accord with those prevailing in non-Jewish circles, the resemblance must be attributed to parallel development rather than to mutual interaction. Given the scriptural impetus, both Jews and non-Jews proceeding by separate routes through the ages, have arrived at nearly analogous ideals. All of the conspicuous elements in the ideals of family life prevalent in the United States at present, namely, (1) monogamy; (2) affection; (3) maintenance; (4) education, have their counterparts not only in Jewish life as it exists today, but already in Jewish traditions of varying degrees of antiquity.

1. MONOGAMY

Monogamy was made a legal mandate in Judaism throughout the Western world about the year 1000 of the Christian era. The outstanding personality in this famous enactment was Rabbi Gershom ben Judah, of Mainz (960-1040). All that Rabbi Gershom and his associates did, however, was to articulate in the form of a command that which had been Jewish practice for fully fifteen hundred years. While polygamy is permitted in the Old Testament, the traces of polygamous practice after the Babylonian deportation in the sixth century B. C. are extremely rare. The Old Testament itself presupposes monogamy in many of its most noted passages. Monogamy prevails in Paradise and also in Noah's ark. It is only in the sixth generation after Paradise that bigamy first appears, Lamech being represented as having taken to himself two wives. Such phrases as "wife of thy bosom", and the passage in Proverbs:

"Rejoice in the wife of thy youth,
Be thou ravished with her love"

are hardly compatible with any but the monogamic relation. Similar are the phrases in Malachi "the wife of thy youth", "thy companion", "the wife of thy covenant". The ideal woman in the thirty-first chapter of Proverbs is conceivable only in a monogamic setting.

From the Biblical prohibition of adultery, the transition to the single standard of morals was natural and inevitable. That Judaism developed the single standard already in remote antiquity can be asserted unequivocally. The Pentateuchal penalties for seduction are ancient. The Book of Proverbs seems to favor promiscuity with unmarried women no more than it does with married women. Job makes a covenant with his eyes not to "gaze upon a virgin."

But it is in the later Jewish writings, in the writings of the Talmudic

[*Professor in the Department of Social Studies, the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.]

group and epoch, that the single standard is most in evidence. For rape, the Talmud imposes a three-fold penalty, and for seduction a four-fold penalty. Another Talmudic passage says that the bitter water ordeal described in the fifth chapter of Numbers is as much a test for the husband as it is for the wife. Unless the husband is himself immaculate, the ordeal will not be effective. Yet another passage tells of a student who committed suicide from chagrin because his phylacteries, which he had mislaid, happened to be picked up by a courtesan and exhibited by her to his associates. "Look upon no woman, fair or homely, married or unmarried" is yet another Talmudic admonition. The story of Rabbi Eleazar ben Duradya is such a classic expression of the single standard ideal as to deserve quotation in full:

Eleazar ben Duradya was wont to consort with every harlot that he could find. Once he heard of such a woman in a distant land whose price was a purse full of dinarri. He took the sum and crossed seven rivers to reach the woman. In the course of their commerce, the woman found occasion to remark:

"Just as a puff of gas never returns to its source, so will Rabbi Eleazar ben Duradya never return to Divine favor."

Eleazar then went forth and placed himself between two mountains or hills.

"Mountains and hills," he exclaimed, "beseech mercy for me."

The reply came:

"Ere we beseech mercy for thee, we must first beseech mercy for ourselves, for it is written 'The mountains shall depart and the hills be removed,' (Isaiah 54, 10)."

Then he exclaimed:

"Oh heaven and earth, beseech mercy for me."

The reply came:

"Ere we beseech mercy for thee, we must first beseech mercy for ourselves, for it is written, 'The heavens shall vanish like smoke and the earth wax old like a garment,' (Isaiah 51, 6)."

Then he exclaimed:

"Oh sun and moon beseech mercy for me."

But the sun and the moon replied:

"First we must beseech mercy for ourselves, for it is written, 'The moon shall be confounded and the sun put to shame,' (Isaiah 24, 23)."

Then he exclaimed:

"O stars and luminaries, beseech mercy for me."

But the stars and the luminaries replied:

"First we must beseech mercy for ourselves, for it is written 'All the host of the heaven shall be dissolved,' (Isaiah 34, 4)."

Then said Rabbi Eleazar:

"I have none but myself to depend upon."

He thereupon placed his head between his knees and sobbed his life away. A voice was then heard in the heavens:

"Rabbi Eleazar ben Duradya is admitted to life everlasting."

The Rabbis regard it as necessary for a man as for a woman to keep free from suspicion. A man should not converse with a woman on the street though she be his own sister. The story is told of Rab Amram,

the Pious, who, when in charge of some captive women, put them into a room which had to be approached with a ladder that it took ten men to carry. Then there is Rab Hiyyah bar Assi, who, having mistaken his wife for a courtesan and having had lascivious desires, does such penance that he fasts himself to death. It is contrary to Talmudic propriety for a man to be alone with a woman or even with two women or to walk behind a woman. "Remove thy feet from hell," says a sage to one of his disciples as they became aware that a woman is walking in front of them. The old Rabbinic homilies contain a passage to the effect that, just as the Nazarite must abstain not only from wine, but from all parts of the grape and from all kinds of grapes, so must a man, to keep pure, avoid touching, embracing or kissing a woman. In the interests of chastity, a bachelor may not be a teacher or a woman a scribe, a teacher or a soldier. "Whoso, with lascivious intent, dallies when counting coins into the hand of a woman with whom he trades will incur hell fire, although his learning and his merits otherwise be as great as those of Moses." It is a beautiful Talmudic passage which tells how a Rabbi comes upon a young woman kneeling in prayer. Her prayer is that through her "men may not stumble." A shocking extreme, on the other hand, is the legend which tells how a certain Rabbi cursed his beautiful daughter to death for fear that her charms would exert a corrupting influence upon persons of the other sex.

2. AFFECTION

Affection between husband and wife finds frequent expression already in the Old Testament; witness the affection of Abraham for Sarah, of Jacob for Rachel, of Paltiel for Michal, and of Ezekiel for his wife, who was "the desire of his eyes." Of the ideal woman in the thirty-first chapter of Proverbs, it says:

"Her children shall rise up and call her blessed;
Her husband also and he praiseth her."

In spite of the growing tendency in Judaism to make divorce as difficult as possible, the idea persists that, when affection between husband and wife has waned, divorce restrictions should apply with leniency. This is the rationale of the otherwise revolting statement that a husband should divorce his wife the moment he finds another woman more attractive. Significantly, it is upon the authority of Rabbi Akiba whose own home life was celebrated for its devotion and ideality that this audacious maxim is offered. Another Rabbi said: "Divorce her if you hate her." When a husband betrays lack of affection, it is the woman's right to obtain a divorce. The evidence of such deficient affection need be no more than the husband's failure to prevent certain whimsical acts of self denial on the wife's part. Thus it is an inconsiderate husband who would neglect to exercise his prerogative of annulling his wife's vows when those vows require, for instance, that the woman abstain from eating fruit for a certain time or that she avoid certain ornaments or cosmetics or refrain for a certain period, from visiting her parents. The woman is entitled to a divorce also if the husband has certain serious defects, or if he is a leper or a person with a bad breath or a collector of dog manure or a copper miner; likewise if the man refuses cohabitation beyond a certain period, or if he exacts of her degrading tasks or unduly

limits her freedom by forbidding her, for instance, to wear ornaments, or to visit her parents, or to go to a ball, or to a house of mourning, or to borrow or lend certain domestic articles. One school of ancient Rabbis would allow a divorce "if she spoil the soup." Any marriage is invalid if either party has deceived the other regarding social station or wealth.

This, however, is only Talmudic theory. In actual practice, under the old Jewish system, divorce was extremely rare. An entire school of Rabbis is in agreement with the Sermon on the Mount that divorce should occur for no cause except infidelity. Malachi 2, 14, is interpreted in the Talmud as a deprecation of all divorce. "When a man divorces his first wife," says another passage, "the altar sheds tears." "How bitter is divorce!" observes another authority in the same context. Again, the statement occurs that an early death is the penalty of the man who desires his wife out of the way in order to get her money and then to marry another.

The doctrine that marriages are made in heaven also finds frequent Talmudic expression. God, it says, finds the task of mating couples properly as difficult as cleaving the Red Sea. "We read in the Law and in the Prophets that all mating is from God." "Since the completion of the world, God has been occupied mating couples."

The law that the husband might have only the income but never the principal of the wife's marriage portion and that the wife may, upon divorce, take the marriage portion with her was expressly designed as a restraint upon divorce.

Everything considered, it may be said that the ancient Jewish conception permitted married life to rest more completely upon spontaneous affection than is the case in our modern systems. Love rather than law was depended upon to secure the permanence of the marriage relation.

We find, at the same time, much greater precaution about entering upon that relation than is our modern wont. Mercenary marriages are condemned. One Rabbi holds that "whoso weds for the sake of money, will have unworthy children." Such a one will ultimately lose all of his possessions, both what he had originally and what his wife brought him. Another Rabbi taught that "whoso weds a woman that is unsuitable is regarded by Scripture as one who plows up the entire earth and sows it with salt." "Whoso weds unsuitably, Elijah binds him and God lashes him; or rather Elijah writes concerning him and God seals the words, 'Woe unto him who vitiates his seed and debases his family.'" Conversely, "Whoso weds a suitable woman, Elijah kisses him and God loves him." A man is forbidden to wed a woman before he has seen her; there may be about her something repellent that might spoil their wedded life. "Whoso vows to wed and to settle in the Holy Land, need not do so until he has first found the right woman." The daughters of Zelofhad are praised for having refused to enter upon unsuitable marriage alliances. "Whoso weds a woman unsuited to be his wife, violates five prohibitions." While a father may betroth his daughter during her minority or even her infancy, the betrothal becomes invalid if the girl, upon reaching maturity, feels dissatisfied with the match.

The Jewish ideal of strong affection but weak divorce laws is illustrated by one of the old Jewish folk tales:

A couple, childless after ten years of married life, were obliged, according to the law, to become divorced. A noted Rabbi, who was interested in their case, advised them to terminate their happy life together by a joyous banquet and a happy gathering of their friends. In the course of the feast, the husband, glowing with wine, said to his wife:

"My daughter, select anything in this house that you may fancy and take it with you tomorrow when you return to your parents' dwelling."

After the man fell asleep, the woman directed the servants to pick him up with the bed in which he lay and to transport him to her father's residence. When the man awoke, he said:

"My daughter, where am I?"

"In my father's home," she answered.

"What have I to do in your father's home?" he queried.

She replied:

"Did you not tell me to take anything in the house on which I had set my heart? There is nothing in the world upon which I have set my heart more than upon you."

The sequel to the story is that the efficacious prayers of their noted Rabbi friend cured their childlessness.

"Is thy wife small? Stoop and whisper to her," says the Talmud. Another saying is: "Let a man be scrupulous about honoring his wife, because whatever blessing prevails in a man's home is there because of his wife." "Whoso loves his wife like himself and honors her more than himself shall attain the Scriptural promise, 'Thou shalt know that thy tent is in peace.'" "When a husband dies, none misses him like his wife; when a wife dies, none misses her like her husband. Concerning Rachael's death, Jacob said, 'I found that harder to bear than all of my other troubles put together.'" "If a man's first wife dies, it is as though the Temple were destroyed in his days." "Every man whose wife dies during his life time—the world is dark about him." "Let a man beware of vexing his wife; retribution for her tears is nigh." A man's wife is the joy of his heart. Remove the letter Y from the Hebrew word for "man" and the remaining letters spell the Hebrew word for "fire." Similarly remove the "H" from the Hebrew word for "woman" and the residuum also spells the Hebrew word for "fire." But Y and H together spell the Hebrew word for God (YaH). This implies that when God departs from the marital relation, naught but the fire of contention remains. If one would have offspring, he must love and cherish his wife.

Utterances also occur dwelling upon the wife's regard for the husband, it being understood that a man must deport himself in such manner as to win and hold his wife's respect. There is, for instance, a rule that a groom may not enter the bride's chamber without first asking her consent. A man whose wife domineers over him is one to whose miseries Heaven is unresponsive and whose life is no life. The wife should not be quick tempered. She should be a good housekeeper and should dress becomingly. She should avoid flirtation and conduct herself modestly. Cohabitation is so far the woman's duty that for refusal to cohabit beyond a certain period, she is fined a weekly deduction from her marriage portion.

The children also are embraced in the circle of affection. "Lo, children are a heritage of the Lord," says the Psalmist.

"Thy wife shall be as a fruitful vine,
In the innermost parts of thy house;
Thy children are like olive plants,
Round about thy table."

Notwithstanding that, the Jewish birth rate, at least in modern times, has been, in most parts of the world, lower than the non-Jewish birth rate, fecundity is a blessing much celebrated and a virtue much extolled. The Talmud knows about contraception, yet counsels the use of such expedients only when the life of the mother or the health of other infants or of an infant yet to be born are at stake. The affection of Abraham for Isaac, of Hagar for Ishmael, of David for Absalom are classic examples of parental devotion. To denote the poor man's fondness for his pet ewe, the text in Samuel says that "it did eat of his own morsel and drank of his own cup and lay in his bosom and was unto him as a daughter." "Like as a father pitieth his children" is an exquisite simile in the Psalms. Messianic import attaches to the passage at the end of Malachi, "He shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children and the heart of the children to their fathers."

Divergent in sentiment are the frequent admonitions in the wisdom literature about the need of corporal punishment. Significantly, however, the most brutal of these admonitions is to be found not in a canonical, but in an apocryphal book. "He that loveth his son causeth him oft to feel the rod. . . . Laugh not with him. . . . Give him no liberty. . . . Bow down his neck. . . . Beat him on the sides," etc., are expressions occurring only in a book that was not admitted to the sacred collection. The Talmud urges utmost moderation in the matter of corporal punishment which it contemplates in none except scholastic connections. The law in Deuteronomy regarding the death penalty for the recalcitrant son is virtually abrogated in the Talmud. Frankenberg, in his commentary to Proverbs 19, 18, observes that the proverbial admonition to use the rod accorded with an ancient Jewish reluctance to do so and a preference for handling children with extreme leniency. The New Testament idea that children, in some special manner exemplify the Kingdom of Heaven has its Talmudic parallels. "The little ones look upon the face of the Shekinah" is the saying in one ancient Rabbinic collection. The Talmud holds that the Biblical words, "Touch not mine anointed and do my prophets no harm" refer to the school children. "Whoever, though starving, sells either a sacred scroll or his daughter will never see any blessing in the world."

What the Bible says about honoring parents is, in the later books, copiously amplified. One Rabbi declares that God, Father and mother are partners in a man's creation. To honor parents is therefore like honoring God and to vex parents like vexing God. One authority says that the words in Leviticus, "Ye shall fear every man, his mother and his father," putting the mother first, implies that both parents have equal claim to the children's respect. Of one ancient worthy it is related that when he would hear his mother approaching, he would exclaim: "I must arise before the Shekinah."

Several pages of the Talmud are devoted to anecdotes recounting the extraordinary devotion of various persons toward their parents, the children cheerfully submitting not only to inconvenience and financial loss, but even to personal indignities at the hands of their elders sooner than do ought in the way of disrespect. The custom of reciting memorial prayers in honor of deceased parents is one of the most persistent in Jewish ritualism.

A significant passage, however, removed by only one page from the long list of encomiums on respect for parents contains an intimation that it is as much the parent's duty to evoke respect as it is the child's duty to accord respect. Discussing the verse in Leviticus "Thou shalt rise before the hoary head and honor the face of the old man," a well-known Talmudic teacher comments: "You might suppose that this applies even when the hoary person is wicked and worthless. Not thus! But 'old man' must be understood to mean 'wise man' as in Numbers 11, 16." Another Rabbi says that "old man" means simply any one who has acquired wisdom, even a person young in years. Parents are not specifically referred to in this passage. Yet the point involved comes up apropos the general subject of respecting parents. Could the ancient Rabbis have felt that parental respect is something dependent, in a measure, upon the conduct of the parents themselves? Indeed, is respect of any kind something that can be demanded or exacted? Is it not necessarily something that can only be inspired, only awakened spontaneously by the admirable qualities of the respected person? Jewish tradition seems to have been upon the verge of this perception. Would not our modern ideals of filial relations be all the sounder with this consideration accentuated more than is our present tendency?

3. MAINTENANCE

The maintenance of the family devolves upon the husband and father. Already the Bible says that a woman is obliged to live with her husband only so long as he provides her with food, clothing and sexual attentions. To support his wife is the husband's legal obligation even when the relation is the transitional one between wife and divorcee. The Jewish law stipulates the legal minimum of food that a husband must provide his wife, also of clothing, household furniture, cosmetics, adornments and medical treatment. These rights may not be conditioned away. Similar is the father's legal and moral obligation to support his children, at least to a certain age. Whoso neglects to support his children is likened to a dragon which begets young and "throws them upon the community." Some authorities hold that re-imbursement may legally be extracted from a man's property for expenses entailed by the community in supporting his children, during his absence from home.

The daughters have a prior claim over the sons to maintenance from the deceased father's estate. Pending the repayment of her marriage portion, a widow must be supported by the husband's heirs. This marriage portion is a first lien upon the deceased husband's property. Not even in direct poverty may the husband touch the principal of the wife's marriage portion. Even an adultress does not forfeit her marriage

portion if her husband fails to petition for the bitter water ordeal described in the fifth chapter of Numbers. Nor does a woman forfeit her marriage portion if she refuses to live with her husband when he has moved away from Jerusalem or from Palestine. There is one Talmudic passage in which the question is raised whether a husband is responsible for the wife's debts.

The maintenance function of the husband and father is expressively brought out in a Rabbinic passage which parallels the Shakespearian "Seven Ages of Man":

At birth a child is pampered like a king.

At two or three, he wallows in the mud like a swine.

At ten, he frisks like a goat.

At twenty, making love, he plumes himself and neighs like a horse.

He weds and has to work like an ass.

Begetting children and seeking their sustenance, he becomes fierce as a dog.

In old age, he dodders like an ape.

But if he be a man of learning,

Old age, with its majesty,

Brings back his initial kingship.

The old Jewish system does not appear to have contemplated the woman as an income earner, although the profession of soldier, despite the prowess of Deborah, and the profession of school teacher and that of scribe are the only ones from which women are specifically debarred and this, for reasons of sexual morality. "Whoso counts upon the earnings of his wife" says a Talmudic authority "will never experience blessing." The woman's duties as described in the thirty-first chapter of Proverbs are limited to the home. One Rabbi of old remarked: "I do not call my wife 'wife' and I do not call my home 'home' but I call my wife 'home' and my home 'wife.'" "His wife" is the interpretation given in the Talmud for the words "his tent" in Leviticus 14, 8. In fact, a Talmudic word for "his wife" (Debethu) means etymologically "of his home." A celebrated passage specifies the duty of the wife to be grinding, baking, washing, cooking, nursing, bed-making, and weaving. In modern times, the proportion of married women employed as wage earners is well known to be lower for the Jewish group than for any other.

4. EDUCATION

The education of the children, especially of the sons, is also a duty devolving upon the father. The woman's most honored part was that of encouraging the studies of her husband and sons and of escorting the small boys to school and giving personal attention to their lessons. Already the Pentateuch enjoins and commends the religious education of the young by their parents. But industrial and physical training also entered into the paternal obligation. A father must teach his son a trade and also teach him how to swim. "Whoso fails to teach his son a trade teaches him robbery."

As regards the education of women, Jewish tradition is not so well abreast of our modern ideals. One Rabbi goes so far as to say that whoever instructs his daughter in the Torah virtually instructs her in

depravity. And yet, John Ruskin, in our own time, strange as it may sound, held kindred views. Torah study, among the Jews, meant essentially religious, that is, theological education. John Ruskin, notwithstanding his modernity and liberality, would, as is well known, debar or, at least dissuade, women from such studies. Apparently, however, Jewish girls were instructed in the Bible and in the household arts. At least one Rabbi favors Torah education for girls, giving as his reason that a knowledge of the fifth chapter of Numbers would act as a deterrent to adultery. Another authority holds that the study of Greek is suitable for girls.

Here again, Jewish practice was more in harmony with modern ideas than Jewish theory. Educated women appear throughout Jewish history. We can not, in this place, even begin an enumeration; entire volumes having been required for this subject. In modern Jewish life, the educational discrimination against women has disappeared completely. Jewish women are represented by, perhaps, more than their quota in all of the high schools and colleges. Even in the backward countries of Eastern Europe, the percentage of illiteracy among the Jewish women is smaller than that among the non-Jewish.

The reciprocal ethical influence of husband and wife upon one another is also observed. A wife, it is asserted, can enlighten her husband's eyes and put him on his feet. An anecdote is recounted in the ancient homilies telling how a good woman elevated a bad husband and how a bad woman degraded a good husband. The Talmud sees a similar purpose in the Pentateuchal passage limiting the number of wives which a king is permitted to have. The husband, on his part, is enjoined to see to it that, no matter how many servants he can afford, his wife shall have something useful with which to occupy her time because indolence leads to "lasciviousness" and "distraction."

Not least among the parental duties is that of advancing the children's matrimonial interests. Of a person who reaches the age of twenty without having married, God says "disperse his bones." Betrothal may be negotiated even on the Sabbath and even when the parties concerned are only infants. The Talmud contains a discussion regarding which should receive prior attention, marriage or study. Some put twenty years, some sixteen, some fourteen as the age limit of bachelorhood. One Rabbi remarked that, had he married at fourteen, he could have said to the Devil, "a dart in thine eye!" Among those to whom the verse is applied, "Thou shalt know that thy tent is in peace," is he who "inducts his sons and daughters into the right way and sees to their early marriage." So important is the marriage of a girl that, hyperbolically speaking, her father should, if necessary, manumit his slave and give him to the girl in marriage as soon as she is mature. A Jew who is without a wife lives without "joy, blessing or good."

Much has been said and written about the ceremonial life of the Jewish home. The Sabbath benedictions, the festive lights, the Pass-over meals, the blessing of the children, the ceremonial burning of the dough, the clearance of the leaven, the booth and the palms of the Tabernacle Feast and various other observances are frequently enumerated and lauded for their efficacy in cementing family attachment and in educating the young. Much of the eulogizing fails to take into

account, however, the susceptibility of all ceremonial to deterioration into formalism and its tendency to survive amid social changes that deprive it of its vitality, significance and beauty. The deservedly vaunted charm of much Jewish ceremonial was limited to times and places offering the requisite environment. It is illusory to assume that all of the rituals which were impressive in sixteenth century Poland are equally impressive in twentieth century America.

Jewish writings are also not without parallels to the sentiment occurring occasionally in the New Testament that there may be obligations higher than those of the family. One well known saying is that, in certain cases of need, a man's teacher takes precedence over his father because "his father brought him into this life but his teacher brings him into the life of the world to come." We have already cited the Talmudic passage telling of the Rabbi who cursed his beautiful daughter to death because he feared that her beauty would menace the morals of persons of the other sex. Following this is the story of the ancient saint who devoted to charity the money intended for his own daughter's dowry. The old homilies likewise tell of the man who gave to charity the ten pieces of money with which his wife had directed him to obtain food for the household. Another story is that of a father who, depriving his own son, donated to the Temple an entire box of dinarii. One is reminded of the mother who urged her son to undergo martyrdom but, above all, of the tribe of Levy near the end of the Book of Deuteronomy:

"Who said of his father and of his mother,
'I have not seen him';
Neither did he acknowledge his brethren,
Nor knew he his own children:
For they have observed Thy word,
And keep Thy covenant."

Thus were many of the ideals of family life to which we of modern America subscribe already developed or being developed in Jewish antiquity, especially the ideals of monogamy, of the "single standard" and of affection among the members of the household; while somewhat greater than in our own system was the Jewish tendency to stress love rather than law as the basis of the marital union. Modern life may favor a much wider occupational scope for women than does Jewish tradition; still, we of today are not oblivious to the importance of woman as a home maker, while the Jewish wife's freedom from all whimsical restraints and trammels that the husband might impose is decidedly in line with our modern predilections. We agree with Jewish tradition about the importance of educating the young vocationally, physically, and morally, but are not so much in accord when it comes to the part assigned the parents in the formation of the children's marriage alliances. Finally, while the demand that children respect their parents is as wide spread today as it was in ancient times—whatever the differences in juvenile conduct—the suggestion may not be regarded as unimportant that the idea of the parent's share in evoking and meriting that respect, hinted in the Talmud, should find, with our modern views on Psychology, Child Study, and Education, valuable expansion and elaboration.

Some Later Books Bearing on Religious Education and the Family

MARY E. MOXCEY, PH. D.*

I.

If one goes through the subject catalogue of any good library for either "Family," or "Religious Education, Family," it is interesting to note how the dates of publication form two sharp curves. The apex of one is at about 1908, of the other about 1914. The output of volumes at these periods seems to have been stimulated respectively by the first Child Welfare Conference and by the interest in Madame Montessori's experiments. A fairly exhaustive bibliography¹ prepared in 1914 and revised in 1918 includes practically all of this material of permanent worth, hence none of that list will be repeated here. The critical notes are sufficient to indicate the value of any particular volume for present use. Their work was well and permanently done, and except for popularizing and adapting, there has been little added in the general fields of explaining the physiology and biological foundations of child life and physical care, interpreting the nature of the child (genetic psychology and theology or philosophy), stating the general principles of the educational process, and making the concrete application to religious objectives under home conditions.

The popularizing and adapting, however, has produced some very good books, some of them primarily for parents, others for teachers but dealing with subjects quite as useful to parents. Several which have been prepared for parent-teacher associations connected with public schools have helpful material on moral and ethical problems of child life. The following list is typical rather than exhaustive.

Character Training in Childhood, Elizabeth Haviland. Small, Maynard & Co., 1922.

In excellent English, but so simple that the foreign mother can understand it, and dealing with the earliest years.

Living With Our Children, Clara D. Pierson. Dutton, 1923.

Vital everyday problems, charming style. Essays prepared for Mothers' clubs and Parent-Teacher associations.

The Unseen Side of Child Life, Elizabeth Harrison. Macmillan, 1922.

Understanding, interpreting and directing the spiritual currents.

Betty May, Helen Patten Hansen. Abingdon Press, 1923.

An exquisite appreciation of the religious significance to a child of happenings in her life from twenty months to three years of age.

The Home Education of Children, William Byron Forbush. Funk and Wagnalls, 1919.

Two volumes in this popular writer's familiar style, tabulating and summarizing the content and emphases of home instruction for the first three years, four to six, six to twelve or fourteen, fourteen and upward.

The Parents' Library (Professor M. V. O'Shea, Editor). Drake, Chicago

First Steps in Child Training, M. V. O'Shea.

*Of the Editorial Staff of the Sunday School Publications of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Cincinnati, Ohio.

¹"A Brief Bibliography of Religious Nurture in the Home," by Mary E. Moxcey, Religious Education, Vol. X., page 610 (December, 1915) and Vol. XIII, page 75 (February, 1918).

The Trend of the Teens, M. V. O'Shea.

The Faults of Childhood and Youth, M. V. O'Shea.

Everyday Problems in Child Training, M. V. O'Shea.

Maternity and Infant Care, W. H. Galland, M. D.

The Proper Feeding of Infants, W. H. Galland, M. D.

Putting Young America in Tune, Henriette Weber.

The Home Guide to Good Reading, Professor David Harrison Stevens.

Some of these combine educational insight with somewhat superficial rule-of-thumb disposal of problems, but they are a useful answer to the demand "Tell me something to do about it, don't theorize on how it happened!" The series should be included in a parents' library.

Child Training, Angelo Patri. Appleton, 1922.

This great school teacher understands the problems of parents as well as of schools, and by vivid, concrete instances brings out sound and clearly applicable solutions.

Parenthood and Child Nurture, Edna Dean Baker. Macmillan, 1922.

The president of the National Kindergarten and Elementary College gives help to parents in understanding and caring for the bodies, minds and spirits of their children through the eleventh year.

The American Home Series, Norman E. Richardson, Editor. Abingdon Press.

Pamphlets, each a monograph on a single subject, such as "Children's Lies," "Thumb-sucking," "Sunday in the Home," or the religious life of children of each age-development group. Very valuable for discussion groups or home reading, as selection can be made of exactly the topic desired. New numbers have been added.

The Use of Motives in Teaching Morals and Religion, T. W. Galloway. Pilgrim Press, 1917.

Written for Sunday-school teachers but good also for parents.

The Emancipation of Youth, Arthur E. Roberts. Revell, 1922.

A director of boy scout work writes in a witty and popular style, and much of his book is useful to parents in understanding the developments causing the more difficult phenomena of boy life.

Adolescence, Frederick T. Tracy. Macmillan, 1920.

Contains little that is new and a little that has lost ground, but on the whole forms a good summary of the accepted knowledge of the period.

High Schools and Sex Education, Gruenberg. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1922.

A summary of the best methods and materials, with good bibliographies.

The Sex Side of Life, Mrs. Mary Ware Dennett. 350 West 55th Street, N. Y. C.

A pamphlet which recognizes the justice of the complaint of boys and girls at an age not to be satisfied with poetry and analogy, that all the books "stop at just what we want to know" and fearlessly and honestly tells as well as spiritually and socially interprets the normal physical and emotional experiences of sex.

Denominational and interdenominational publishing houses have been doing notable work in producing textbooks that are scientifically accurate, in good form for teaching and studying, and sufficiently untechnical to be both intelligible and interesting to the average parent.

Childhood and Character, Hugh H. Hartshorne. Pilgrim Press, 1919.

Besides excellent psychology and workable methods of character training, this contains directions for genuine, first-hand observation of children, for the purpose of understanding and helping them, and many specimens of such observations.

Training of Children in the Christian Family, Luther A. Weigle. Pilgrim Press, 1922.

Combines common sense and experience with sound traditions and current scientific information in the treatment of family problems, some of which project themselves into school and church.

The Mother-Teacher of Religion, Anna Frelove Betts. Abingdon Press, 1922.

A comprehensive and thoroughly usable manual on the subject, for classes, and also for daily reference by mothers.

The Debt Eternal, John H. Finley. Missionary Education Movement, 1923.

Prepared for study classes of the Women's Home Missionary societies and Young People in churches for the special study topic of the year, but of permanent value in its broad vision of the relations to the child and to the home of the community standards, of industrial conditions, and of church activities for social righteousness.

Parents and Their Children, Moxcey-Ward. Methodist Book Concern, 1922.

A first book for parents' classes in the Sunday school; compact and readable.

Religious Education in the Family, Henry F. Cope. University of Chicago Press, 1915.

Education for Democracy, Henry F. Cope. Macmillan, 1920.

The Parent and the Child, Henry F. Cope. Doran, 1921.

Though the first of these goes back of the date arbitrarily set, the three form a harmonious development of the theme of which Dr. Cope gave the keynote and the *motif* in the little pamphlet published in 1910—(*The Home a School for Social Living*. American Baptist Publishing Soc.).

In the Third-Year Specialization Courses for Sunday-school teachers, approved by the International Sunday School Council of Religious Education, the following units are of equal value to parents:

A Study of the Little Child, Mary T. Whitley.

Child Study for Teachers of Primary Children, Mary T. Whitley.

Child Study for Teachers of Beginners, Mary T. Whitley.

Story Telling for Teachers of Beginners and Primary Children, K. D. Cather.

The Psychology of Early Adolescence, E. Leigh Mudge.

The Psychology of Middle Adolescence, Mary E. Moxcey (in preparation).

The Psychology of Later Adolescence, E. Leigh Mudge (in preparation).

A beginning has been made for providing material for use in the home.

Home Lessons in Religion, Samuel Wells Stagg and Mary Boyd Stagg. Abingdon Press, 1922, 1923.

Vol. 1, The Three-Year-Old.

Vol. 2, The Four-and-Five-Year-Old.

A practical program for home lessons for every day in the year providing stories, object lessons, songs, prayers, and "something to do."

* * *

II

So much for the material which is all classified and labeled, and most of it available without much interpretation or modification for the "average parent." It is the product of the activity of leaders in moral and religious education. What is there to challenge and stimulate the thinking of these leaders themselves and to shape their progress in the next few years? Religious education by its very terms includes the idea of a valuation of life which shall make certain objectives supremely worth the cost of securing them as part of the heritage of the next generation. Since 1914, the last "peak" of progress in new view-points in education, a world cataclysm has challenged all our religious ideals and accepted concepts of the meaning and purpose of life, and thrown grave doubts on the validity of our educational methods. Welton's statement is pertinent: "Nor is there general agreement . . . as to the end that should be sought as a whole. Nor can agreement on such points be expected while men differ widely as to the meaning and purpose of life."

The perpetuation of the family itself as an ideal and as an institution is one of these fundamental questions which is being subjected to merciless revaluation. On the one hand its stability is threatened by tremendous forces of which the prevalence of divorce and the decreasing number of children per family are only the most patent symptoms. On the other hand, there are endless suggestions for the modification of the family for better service of the young.

Some of the questions which are impossible of facile answer are: Is the monogamous marriage practical in a generation in which so vast a proportion of marriageable men have been killed? Is it moral to continue to attempt home life between two people who find each other increasingly uncongenial and difficult? Is there a "right to motherhood" which should make honorable the birth and rearing of children without a legal father? How is the increasing proportion of women in industry to affect marriage and home life? Does the increasing cost of living demand moral and religious sanction for decreasing the number of children? Is the higher education of women fatal to the perpetuation of the more able families?

For a perspective of the family as an institution nothing is better than the *History of the Family* by Dr. Wyllistine Goodsell. Her later book, *The Education of Women* (Macmillan, 1923), bears also on this subject in the chapters "College Women and the Marriage Rate," "The Vocational Education of Working Girls," and "Social Education of Women." It has also especially useful topical bibliographies of the voluminous discussions in recent periodicals.

The Family and Its Members. Anna Garlin Spencer (Lippincott, 1923).

Gives in brief compass a social and philosophical discussion which is modern and sane.

Directly and indirectly the ideals, the expressive activities, and even the very existence of the family are affected by its economic status. Mary Hinman Abel has made an excellent study of *Successful Family Life* (Lippincott, 1921), which gives concrete and convincing examples of "self-expression in the arts" as practiced in the "art of living together in the family," at the same time the difficulty thereof is not minimized.

The Normal Life, Edward T. Devine. McMurtrie, 1917.

Gives both moral and spiritual standards of ideals from the standpoint of a Christian authority in social work.

Among the forces producing a wide disparity of attitude toward the family, certainly one is the present economic and industrial organization of society, and another, related to it, is the chaotic juxta-position of different civilizations and cultures which is a world-wide condition. American family life is bound to be increasingly more affected by European thinking. The underlying philosophy of the family which dominates so much of our present fiction, both indigenous and imported, is of a very different type from the philosophy of Froebel and Pestaozzi. Ten years ago Ellen Keys' "The Century of the Child" was endorsed, while many of her theories of adult human relations scandalized us. Professor Foerster's "Marriage and the Sex Problem," when Stokes brought out an English edition in 1912, seemed quite daring; now it is most conservative and orthodox. No less sincere and earnest discussions of the relation between men and women and their children is contained in *The Sexual Crisis* by Greta Meissel-Hess. In reading it one needs to keep a judicial attitude, and realize the prevalent continental ideas of marriage and the ensuing intolerable conditions responsible for the suggested way out. One must also be ready to face the fact that conditions in America are tending in the direction of the same artificial civilization; and that, moreover, the theoretical conclusions of this author and others are entertained and adopted by many who have not had experience of the conditions which produce them.

At the Pan-American Congress the South American women asked for a list of twelve of our most eminent women in the United States. A high school boy, discussing various newspaper nominations, felt that there should by all means be at least three moving picture stars whom he named. Two of these have since confessed their inability to make a success of the marriages they had then undertaken, and have light-heartedly entered new alliances. Is the present trend to family disintegration permanent or evanescent? Is the waning influence of accepted religious ideals on the conduct of the family a failure of religious educational method, or a mistaken ideal?

The English seem to be thinking more clearly and writing more penetratingly on this subject than are we; perhaps because they are closer to the problem, can the family survive in a world in which all the normal relations are up-set?

Maude Royden in *Sex and Common Sense*, and in many of her sermons—for example *The Ministry of Women, Can We Set the World in Order?*—meets the undeniable difficulties and tragedies with sympathetic insight and high intellectual and moral courage. Dr. Herbert Gray in his book prepared for the Student Christian Union, entitled *Men, Women and God* (Doran, 1922) complements the feminine with the masculine approach to the mutual problem of the family life, and the relations of men and women and the care of children under abnormal conditions. These two books strike the high note of religious interpretation of the puzzling dilemma of individual self-realization and social welfare.

Marriage and Parenthood—The Catholic Ideal, by Thomas J. Girard, is a clear and explicit statement of the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church toward these problems of the family and the current tendency to its volun-

tary limitations in size. It also makes explicit the respective duties of church and home in the religious education of the young and in sex knowledge.

From these large books it is a contrast to come to the little four-page leaflet by Mary Ware Dennett, *The Stupidity of Us Humans*, with its plea that we "add science and art to natural instinct and need, to make the sex function socially productive beyond its primary intent as we have already enriched the instincts to feed, clothe and shelter ourselves."

Principles of Social Psychology, James Mickle Williams. Knopf, 1922.

Contains one section (Book V—Conflict of Interests in Family Relations) which discusses the psychology of the family under the topics, the conflict between the sexes; the basis of congeniality; and the conflict between family egoism and idealism.

Dissatisfaction with the teen-age product of our present families is widespread and vociferous. For the most part it is thus far recorded in periodical articles rather than in serious book treatises.

What's Wrong With Our Girls? Beatrice Forbes-Robertson-Hale. Stokes, 1923.

The question is asked and answered in a little book worth reading. With clear-sighted recognition of the difficulty of family life housed in flats, of complex time schedules, and of nerves over-stimulated from infancy by noises from the city; and accepting the probability that these difficulties will continue to increase, she sees in the modern girl the hope of the continuing woman movement. The initiative of the present generation of women is spent; we can expect from them no further great movement, even against war. We must turn to youth and train them, not to competition but to cooperation. The author shows the possibilities of such training in the modern family, and much that she says is applicable to the religious phases of training which she does not touch.

The Revolt of Youth, Stanley High. Abingdon Press, 1923.

Shows how world-wide is the conscious intention of young people not to repeat the mistakes of their fathers. It is assuredly part of the task of religious education and of the family to sympathize with this protest and to make it unified and positive instead of a formless attempt to do just anything that is different from either the advice or practice of present adults. Youth has assuredly been abetted in its revolt by such adult leaders as Edmond Holmes in *Give Me the Young* and *The Tragedy of Education* (London). He attacks institutional and dogmatic Christianity but pleads for genuine religious life as the only salvation. His protest against imposing the adult on the new personality is stimulating and mainly sane. The "*Dominic*" (Alexander S. Neill), whether he is *In Doubt* or *Dismissed*, would include parents with teachers as potential dangers in hampering new lives while they are helpless. A more positively Christian and constructive attitude is found in Maude Royden's sermon, *The Moral Standards of the Rising Generation*.

It is impossible to follow the latest experiments in general education and to understand current discussions of the development of child personality and its relations to other personalities in the home without at least a minimum of intelligence regarding what is called "the new psychology." Fortunately there is available a non-technical book by an English physician who has had much to do with education, which is a very moderate and conservative statement of the newer theories in regard to mental life!

The New Psychology and the Parent, H. Crichton Miller. Thomas Seltzer, 1922.

Contains a clear and intelligible summary of the main positions of the diverging schools of psycho-analysis and a reasonable and temperate statement of their valid contributions toward the development of the normal child. The problems of authority and reality, of emotional development and of sex instruction are particularly well handled. Some further stimulating new ideas are given in the chapter on religious education. (This is by no means a handbook to the entire subject of psycho-analysis, but it is the only one the present writer has so far discovered which relates the new ideas of personality to "religious education and the family" in a well-balanced and helpful way.)

To review one's "orthodox" psychology and to understand the "insurgents," as well as to feel reasonably abreast with present achievements, one may profitably read these three books:

Psychology, A Study of Mental Life, R. S. Woodworth. Holt, 1921.

Psychology From the Standpoint of a Behaviorist, J. B. Watson. Lippincott, 1918.

Dynamic Psychology, R. S. Woodworth. Columbia University Press, 1918.

There are also some valuable monographs on special groups of instincts and emotions.

Anger, Its Religious and Moral Significance, George Malcolm Stratton. Macmillan, 1923.

The approach is historical and social rather than physiological. The method of teaching control is "not exhorting him not to be angry but telling him what to be angry about."

The Psychology of Prayer, Karl Stolz. Abingdon Press, 1923.

Is philosophical and individualistic rather than social-educational, but its standpoint gives a useful approach to teaching children to pray.

The God-Experience, E. Leigh Mudge. Caxton Press, 420 Plum Street, Cincinnati.

A most helpful and penetrating discussion of the place in the God-experience of the deeper and more intimate senses—hunger, thirst, temperament, sex, pain, smell, etc.

The Child's Knowledge of God, Rev. T. Grigg-Smith. Macmillan, 1920.

The director of religious education in the diocese of Manchester, England, has investigated through the schools the contents of children's minds regarding religion. The queer and false ideas so prevalent rouse insistent queries as to their source, particularly in family training.

In the field of educational method the "project" or "enterprise" is as ubiquitous as the "complex" in individual psychology.

Education and Democracy, Dewey. Macmillan, 1916.

Human Nature and Conduct, Dewey. Holt, 1922.

A Social Theory of Religious Education, Coe. Scribners, 1917.

These are fundamental, and practically sufficient, for an understanding of the underlying philosophy of this method. Its application to the public schools is most concretely brought out in *Character Education Methods (The Iowa Plan)*, Character Education Institution, Chevy Chase, Washington, D. C., 1922.

Perhaps the concentration of the most earnest and far-seeing religious educators of the United States on the topic of Religious Education and the Family in 1924 may produce some epoch-marking books to help us all build the family on which the new social order may rest.

Changes in the Farm Family

DWIGHT SANDERSON, PH. D.*

The present economic depression of American agriculture has forced both business man and politician to recognize that although farming now engages but a minority of our population it is still the basis of our national well-being. Similarly recent surveys of the present status of the rural church, as well as the theological controversies now rife in several denominations, have forced religious leaders to recognize that the foundation of American protestantism is in its rural communities, but that the old superstructure is inadequate to meet their present needs. The new shoots and the flower of our civilization are seen in the cities, but its roots will always be in the soil.

Religious education for rural communities is therefore a live problem, and the success of its program will depend in large measure upon the degree to which it recognizes the whole social situation in rural life, including the changes which are taking place and the probable trend of social adjustment. It is from this standpoint that the changes in the farm family are of significance to the student of religious education. No argument is needed to prove that in the past the farm home has been the greatest factor in the religious life of the countryside or that the farm family is the most fundamental of all rural social institutions. To my mind the possibility of a satisfactory family life is the chief asset of the agricultural industry, and the future of rural civilization rests very largely upon whether good homes or maximum production are its goal. What, then, are the significant changes occurring and probable in the life of the farm family?

First, let us agree to limit the discussion to the farm family. The "rural" family is a confusing category whose chief value seems to be as a means of lumping all families which are not urban, but it is "neither flesh, fowl or good herring." The census classifies all places with a population of under 2,500 as rural, but although there are some conditions common to village and farm families, there are, on the whole, as vital differences between the family life of the farm and the village as between that of the village and the city, and family life in the many industrial villages has much more in common with that of the city. Furthermore, so far as I am aware, we have practically no sociological studies of the village family or its tendencies.

Second, let us recognize that we have little if any statistical evidence with regard to the farm family, with the exception of that which shows the increasing exodus of our rural population to the cities. Our statisticians have been chiefly interested in the increasingly complex problems of the city, and as yet the federal census has not seen fit to tabulate the statistics of the farm family as it has for that of the city. Even such fundamental facts as the average number of members in farm families for given areas or the classification of age groups of farm families are unknown, although the census has the data from which they might be computed and tabulated. These facts are given for the "rural" population, but for the purposes of social analysis that classification is comparatively meaningless. Students of country life will lack such essential statistical evidence until influential organi-

*Professor in the Department of Rural Social Organization, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

zations can convince Congress that funds should be appropriated to the census for the tabulation and publication of the statistics of farm population.

Third, paradoxical as it may sound, there is no such thing as *the* farm family. We all tend to think of the farm family in terms of the community of our boyhood or of those rural communities in which we have lived or visited, but the life and problems of the farm family are as different as are the different communities and regions of this great country, for family life is very largely governed by local tradition and mores. The farm family in New England, among the Pennsylvania Germans, in the Appalachian Highlands, among the tenants of the South, in the Corn Belt, or under the semi-pioneer conditions of parts of the great Northwest, has some common conditions and problems, but the differences are so great that it is almost impossible to generalize with regard to any common characteristics or conditions. Valid generalizations must await the intensive study of the farm family of typical cultural areas, with the diverse economic and social situations within them. An appreciation of these differences is of particular importance in relation to the role of the family in religious education.

However, even though we recognize these limitations in our knowledge of the farm family, there are certain tendencies and trends in its evolution which have been recognized by competent observers, for some of which more or less convincing objective evidence might be assembled, and which it would seem are inherent in the social and economic changes which seem inevitable. These changes in the social organization of the farm family form the social facts with which religious education must deal, although we must recognize that a scientific analysis of adequate information would doubtless materially alter our understanding of them and give a much surer basis for a satisfactory social control. I shall only attempt to sketch what seem to me some of the more significant of these tendencies and some of the conditions from which they arise.

In spite of the romance with which we have surrounded family life in literature and of the sacredness imputed to it by the church, the cold fact seems to be that in the past, indeed in some of the less favored situations at the present time, the chief bond of the farm family was the economic necessity of securing food and clothing from the land and the economic interest of each member of the family in his share in the estate. Farming is the last of the leading industries to remain a family business, and it seems probable that under our present system of agriculture with the home on the farm that the farm business will always be a family affair. Agricultural economists seem to agree that the family farm will conserve the greatest economic and social values. But the industrial revolution has not left the farm untouched by the process of specialization in industry. Gradually, but surely, many of the processes of the farm are being centered in manufacturing plants and work formerly done in the home is taken to the barn or a special building. The separation of the house and the barn and farm is constantly becoming wider in the better organized and more successful farms, and with the undoubted tendency for the best qualified to possess the land and to operate it on the most economic basis, there seems to be no reason why this tendency should not continue. Obviously there are many exceptions to this, for we can all cite many instances in which the mother is the real manager of the farm though it may not be admitted by the ostensible head of the business. Compulsory school attendance, with a lengthening of the school

year to nine months, to a large extent eliminates the labor of the children except for the daily chores, and although there are still large numbers of children whose education is interfered with by farm work, the opponents of child labor are marshalling public opinion against this condition and the day is not far off when it will be practically abolished in all sections of the country. Having finished school, there is now less incentive for the children to remain on the farm. Formerly there was little other opportunity for most of them, for custom decreed that they should assist on the farm until they became of age. Land was relatively cheap, possibly the father had enough to divide with some of the sons, and less capital was required to become independent. There was little opportunity for other employment except to work for a neighboring farmer at relatively low wages. Today the young man who finishes school has opportunity to secure better wages in the town or city. Young people are leaving the farm in larger numbers and at an earlier age than formerly.

All of these factors tend to weaken the economic bond of the farm family, and necessitate the strengthening of other ties for its solidarity. The social strength of the farm family in the past was chiefly due to its economic self-dependence and to its relative isolation.

Now human nature is fundamentally sociable and does not enjoy isolation. For thousands of years, ever since the establishment of agriculture, our ancestors in Europe and Asia lived, for the most part, in agricultural villages in which they were intimately associated in the common struggle for a living and in the enjoyment of their leisure. The settlement of America west of the Alleghenies was the first time in history that a large area became permanently populated with people living on isolated farmsteads. The pioneer endured this isolation in order to secure an estate, but soon his children married and settled near him or relatives settled nearby and a neighborhood of kindred was formed. This process has gone on in every new section and we still have the local names of these neighborhoods, Jones' Corners, Hawkins' Hill, or Barstow's Hollow, though the kin have long since disappeared. Sociability was then confined very largely to the neighborhood and the large families and restricted communication strengthened the bonds of the family. Today the older agricultural states have a smaller farm population, the farms are farther apart and neighborhood life of the old sort has disappeared or tends to decline. The population is more mobile, farms change hands more frequently and new faces are constantly appearing. Better roads, the automobile and the telephone have released farm life from the confines of the neighborhood and sociability is a function of the large community and tends to center in the village. Organizations multiply and tend to segregate various groups by age, sex and particular interests. Individual farm families are not as closely associated as in the days when there was more intimate contact in the more isolated life of the neighborhood. All of these factors tend to weaken the social control of the farm family, because its individual members have more opportunity for wider contacts and because the family sanctions are those which arise in the larger and more heterogeneous group of which it is a part.

Another important factor in the life of the farm family is its decreasing size. The exact amount of this decrease we are unable to measure, for we have no general statistics of the size of farm families from the census.

All we have is the size of "rural" families, and just what the effect of the 39 per cent of rural population which does not live upon farms has upon the size of the "rural" family, we have no statistical evidence. We know that the size of the average family for the whole United States has decreased from 5.6 in 1850 to 4.3 persons in 1920, that in the older states the "rural" family is no larger, and in several states is smaller, than the urban family, but the exact decrease in the size of the *farm* family is unknown. Had we the data to show the decrease in the size of the native white farm family for the last century, it seems probable that it would be greater than that indicated above, if we can give credence to the common impression of the size of the old time family. One of the best valuable studies on this matter has just appeared in the February Century under the title "Slow Suicide Among Our Native Stock," by Edward A. Ross and Ray E. Baber of the University of Wisconsin. In it they show (p. 507) that the families of farmers among the generation of the grandparents of students now in college had 5.9 children, while the families of the generation of their parents numbered but 4.2 children. These figures are for native parentage in both generations. This larger family of our forefathers had a greater hold upon its members because there was more association within the family. Children in large families learn to play with each other and there develop a family spirit, whereas the child in the modern family seeks the satisfaction of playing with others of his own age in the neighborhood or in school. Both the decreasing size of the family and the fewer families place a premium upon association in the school, and these same factors are largely responsible for the growth of consolidated rural schools.

The greater education of women has also been an important element in the present status of the farm home. A century ago practically no farm women received any formal schooling. Two generations ago most of them completed the district school, which in many states meant but a meager education. Today in many of our better agricultural sections a considerable number of the parents and an increasing proportion of the children have had two to four years of high school. This increase of education is, of course, almost equally true of farm men, but it has a much larger significance with relation to the position of the woman in the farm home. The educated woman is much less amenable to the patriarchal rule of the father of the family and she is less contented to see modern improvements in the barn and labor saving machinery on the farm and herself put up with a lack of conveniences in the home. The rapid increase in the circulation of women's magazines since the advent of the rural free delivery has had a very large part in the education of farm women and in bringing them into touch with the modern feminist movement. The whole educational process brings the farm woman to desire better household facilities so that she may have more time for enriching the spiritual life of the home. It is not that she desires more leisure for attending bridge parties or the movies, but she realizes that if she is to be a companion and counsellor of husband and children, she must have time for personal growth. As one farm woman expresses it, "A woman wants time salvaged from housekeeping to create the right home atmosphere for her children, and to enrich their home surroundings that they may gain their tastes for books and music, not from the shop windows, the movies,

the billboards, or the jazz band, but from the home environment."* This statement reveals the new problems of the farm home as it has larger contacts with the village and town.

The better education of farm women and their knowledge of the relative economic independence of women in cities create dissatisfaction with their economic dependence upon the husband and the lack of a real partnership in the distribution of the income between the farm and the home. Farm women produce a considerable part of the farm income, but in a majority of cases they do not share to the same extent in its expenditure. Professor J. M. Gillette estimates that in 1910 the farm women of this country produced over \$737,000,000 of farm products, which exceeded the value of either the wheat crop or the cotton crop for that year.† On most farms where poultry are not kept on a commercial scale the care of poultry is the woman's job, and outside of dairy sections a considerable volume of butter is made in the home. 81 per cent of the women in the North and West care for poultry, but only 22 per cent have the poultry money for their own use and but 16 per cent have the egg money; 60 per cent make butter, and 33 per cent sell butter, but only 11 per cent have the butter money.‡ This problem of the control of family finance tends to adjustment in the better farm homes, but there is no question that in the average and poorer farm homes it is a constant source of irritation. As long as the farm was largely self-dependent this problem did not arise, but as soon as the produce of woman's labor is sold on the market she rightly feels that she should have a larger share in the expenditure of the family income and a definite share for the household expenses.

For the above and other reasons both mother and older children are challenging the autocracy of the father, and the patriarchal regime of the farm family is inevitably doomed. But it is difficult to change the mores established by many generations, and the average farmer is dominated by them until public sentiment or pressure within the family forces concessions from his authority. By and large, man is still an undomesticated animal with regard to his responsibility for the home life, while woman is but a housekeeper. With the enlightenment and enfranchisement of women and the decline of the economic bond of the farm family, this status becomes apparent and when it is perceived is no longer tolerable for a satisfactory family life, particularly inasmuch as a satisfactory family life is probably the most potential value in the vocation of agriculture. Were we to attempt to make the broadest generalization of the means of adjustment of the relations in the farm family, it might be stated as the problem of the education of women and the domestication of men. If there is to be a true partnership, the farm woman must have a better understanding of the farm business and her husband's world as well as all the intricacies of household economy and family management and the civic problems of the community which affect the family life, while the farmer must come to treat the wife as an equal—which he will do only when she has equal intelligence—and must have a real understanding of and a rational and sympathetic participation in rather

*Quoted by Florence E. Ward in "The Farm Woman's Problems," U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, Circular 148 (1920), which contains the summary of a survey of the work and life of farm women of 10,044 farm homes in the North and West.

†J. M. Gillette, *Rural Sociology*, p. 372.

‡c. f. Ward, *l. c.*, p. 11.

than a domination of the family management. This generalization would apply only in lesser degree to most urban families and would be resented by many of the better farm families, but I am dealing with farm life as a whole and with its tendencies. Observation of many farm families, and the consensus of others who have studied these problems, convince me that the above does not misrepresent the general situation.

Formerly, children were regarded as an asset to the farm, particularly the boys. Today, with smaller families there is a greater interest in the welfare of the children and ultimately the farm will be operated for the benefit of the children. If the small farm family is to have the strength of the larger more isolated family of former days, there must be more real comradeship between parents and children, particularly in their earliest years. It is surprising in how few farm homes the parents play games, read or sing with the children, but wherever they do play together there is found a strong family. We are coming into a new conception of the educational value of play and there is no place where this is more apparent than in the farm home. There is no more important asset to the religious education of the child than the confidence and sympathy which is created when both father and mother not only "take time" to play with the children, but enjoy it. Should not the church encourage family recreation as a means to religious education?

The question may be raised as to whether the increased antipathy toward the dominance of the male may not be shown in an increased divorce rate among farm people. Unfortunately we have no statistical evidence as to the relative increased rate of divorce among farmers. What little statistical information there is shows that the divorce rate of those engaged in agriculture is lower than that of almost any occupation, and this is confirmed by common observation. Whether this indicates that there is any less strain in married life among farm people may be a fair question. The cost and legal proceedings involved in divorce are a deterrent to many a farm woman, even if she were able to brave public sentiment. Even more important is the problem of making a living, for the farm woman has no means of support and has no experience in any other occupation if one were available, while few men care to remain on a farm for any length of time without someone to care for the home. The result is that when affection is lost the family often continues to live together, with no real home for the children, or if worse come to worst the wife goes to her parents' home, or the father deserts. The relative number of such cases among farm families as compared with those of town and city is unknown, for social work has barely commenced among rural folk, but the number of them is considerable. There is no question, however, that the conditions of farm life make divorce difficult, and probably this is an element of strength to the farm family.

Another subtle influence in the changing life of the farm family is that its standards tend to become those of the town and city. The greatly increased communication, the reading of the city newspaper and of magazines and agricultural papers whose editors necessarily have the standards of their city life, attendance on the movies, the more frequent trips to town and city, and the visits of city relatives and friends, all give prestige and glamour to the ways of the city. One of the greatest needs of farm life is general appreciation of the possibility of a rural culture equal to that of the city.

but adapted to the needs of the countryside and which will enhance the human values and satisfactions of country life, assimilating the best of urban culture in literature, art, music, recreation, and institutions, but really assimilating so as to strengthen rural ideas rather than merely imitating urban civilization. Possibly the Danes have progressed farther in this direction than any other people. With the growing domination of our city life, and with less than one-third of our people left on our farms, there is a peculiar need of establishing new ideals of rural culture.

This tendency of urban values and ideals to dominate the rural mind inevitably weakens the farm family unless there is a recognition of this danger and a definite attempt is made to develop a discriminating appreciation of the possibilities of rural life and an earnest effort to enrich the life of the farm home. While the best information available indicates that the average farmer makes as good a living as the average man in the city, yet there is no gainsaying the fact that few farmers ever amass great fortunes when measured by city standards nor is there opportunity for them to do so in actual farming. Now urban ideals are largely dominated by the desire for wealth or the material things which wealth will buy, and while the farmer should be encouraged to own an automobile, to have a better house, to furnish it attractively, to have a piano and victrola, to be able to dress better, etc., etc., yet these things in and of themselves will not make farm life satisfying or strengthen the farm family. Indeed they not infrequently have quite the opposite effect. I can see no permanent satisfaction in farm life unless there be an enjoyment of those spiritual and social satisfactions which cluster around the life of the home and intimate association in a friendly community.

The fact is that the farm family faces the same situation as all of our modern life in which, as Professor Ogburn has so well pointed out in his recent book "Social Change"; the rapid advancement of our material culture is controlling our modes of behavior and we seem impotent to adapt our spiritual culture to the new environment with sufficient rapidity to secure a satisfactory social control. We tend to lose the values of life through the very superfluity of material welfare. But although the rural community and the farm home are increasingly a part of our common civilization, yet from their inevitable relative isolation and the nature of the occupation of agriculture, for rural life is always subject to its relation to those processes of Nature upon which farm income depends, their social standards change more slowly and the farm home will ever be the stabilizer of social change.

There is no question that the family may be at its best on the farm and that if the Kingdom of God is to come upon earth it will come through the expansion of the ideals of love and service which have been and must be developed within the family. The rural church needs a new vision of its responsibility for family nurture if it is to succeed in its efforts at religious education.* It needs to become permeated with the love of the family which so pervades the religious life of the Jews.

Here and there a rural church under the leadership of a country-minded young minister is attempting to serve the present life of its people, but far too large a majority of rural churches while decrying the worldli-

*A good example of the recognition of this responsibility is seen in the course on "Christian Fellowship and the Family" in the adult Bible Class Magazine now being published by the Pilgrim Press.

ness of the unchurched are themselves the victims of other-worldliness, their attention being chiefly on the world beyond the grave or the world beyond the ocean, and are quite oblivious to their responsibility for the conditions in their own communities. Meanwhile the agencies which are doing most to strengthen the farm family are secular organizations motivated by a religious faith in the better things in life, but lacking the inspiration which might be given by the church.

The "Ladies' Aid" of the average rural church pursues its routine of sewing parties and church suppers so that the church may have a new roof, a carpet, or a coat of paint, but the women who desire better homes join the Home Bureau or Home Economics Club, the Red Cross, the Parent-Teachers Association, and the W. C. T. U. Their home economics work at first concerns itself with problems of nutrition, clothing and housing, for which a scientific technique has been developed, but soon the human problems of the home command their attention and they turn to child care, recreation, civics, and family management. The Red Cross gives them classes in home nursing and first aid, but here and there a chapter is encouraging "Home Service," which is the only organized attempt at rural social work. It may be fairly replied that these are not enterprises which can be fostered by the church, but, even if that be granted, has the church no responsibility for a serious attempt to give the farm mother a better knowledge of how to cope with the moral and religious life of the family? What of the sex question, for instance? Is there any one influence other than the saloon which is more demoralizing than the ignorance regarding sex and the lack of sane instruction and sympathetic guidance of the young in matters of sex? How many farm homes are giving or can give any intelligent instruction or guidance to their children in this matter? Is there any subject which will more vitally affect their moral and religious life? Why, then, should not the church arrange for the instruction of its women—and men, for that matter—in this most important subject and give religious sanction to their responsibility for the better guidance of their children? Shades of Mrs. Grundy! Yes, but why not try and save human souls from being lost rather than attempt to salvage them from a past which cannot be relived?

So in the care of its children, the church gives them a sort of instruction in the Bible, but it has hardly concerned itself with any systematic attempt to develop right habits and attitudes. It is the Scout organizations which are developing a technique for the training of character, and it is encouraging that most of the rural troops are under such auspices, although so far as I know only the Catholic Church has made any systematic effort to encourage scouting as a church policy. The Junior Red Cross organizes its work with the schools and encourages habits of personal hygiene and is developing a program for training in citizenship, using that term as applied to child life. The Boys' and Girls' Clubs in agriculture and home economics fostered by the extension services of the agricultural colleges, are giving their members a new interest in farm and home, and they are doing much toward the solution of the problem of child labor on the farm by creating a public sentiment which demands that the child shall be given the product of his toil. In the course of time this concession of allowing the boy to have the receipts from his calf, pig, or corn patch, after paying the farm for all expenses, and the girl to have the receipts of her garden, poultry, canning,

baking, or sewing, will have an appreciable effect in bringing about better relations in the farm home, as well as making more proficient farmers and home-makers.

Not that these movements should or could be sponsored by the church, but they should in some way be articulated with the problem of religious education of the rural church, for they have a very large ethical content and are definitely attempting to mould character through activities. Furthermore, there is a danger that unless the farm home makes itself more attractive, some of these juvenile organizations may tend to become the means of satisfying the child's social desires which the home has not gratified, with a consequent weakening of home ties.

The farmer himself finds his chief interest in such organizations as the farm bureau, the grange, the farmers' union, or the cooperative association. These are the organizations which enable him to meet his problems, whose solution means the possibility of a better home. The church is not responsible for instruction in the technique of agriculture, but it should be vitally concerned with its motives and ideals. The country church is strong on stewardship for its own support, but how much does it preach the parable of the talents with regard to the stewardship of the land? At present the farmer's chief interest is in the problem of marketing and he is building large hopes upon the success of the cooperative marketing associations which have sprung up so rapidly in the past decade. The success of the cooperative movement depends upon the intelligent loyalty of its membership. The mere financial gain through cooperative management will hardly be sufficient to maintain this loyalty against the temptation of larger personal gain by selling to other buyers. If the cooperative movement is to permanently succeed it will be due to a loyalty to the principle of cooperation as economic democracy and to a solidarity of its membership from the local group to regional and national federations. The unique thing about the cooperative movement from an ethical standpoint is that while it emphasizes the ultimate advantage to the member, its fundamental principle is the equal share of all in the management and benefits of the organization. It is a system whereby the weak by collective action can secure the advantages of the strong. But without the willingness to sacrifice and the spirit of service for the common good, it is doubtful if it can compete with private business merely as a means to larger profits. The spirit of the cooperative movement is identical with that of the brotherhood of man, and its ideals develop a religious devotion among its truest leaders. Yet in all this great movement, which means so much for a better social order, and through which the farmers of the United States last year did over \$2,000,000,000 of business, the influence of the church has been almost negligible. The city church has been forced to consider the problems of capital and labor and to challenge the present economic system as unchristian, but the rural church has remained oblivious to the ethical and spiritual significance of the cooperative movement and of the immense power which it might exert were it to give the weight of its religious sanction and the encouragement of its inspiration. The recent statement of the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal church with regard to the problems of the rural church in which they commend the cooperative movement is a significant and timely recognition of its ethical significance.

This discussion may seem far afield from my subject, but the point is

that the farmer is interested in these organizations because he sees them as a means for securing better living conditions for his family, less work and worry for the wife, large opportunities for the children, and more comforts for the home. If the church should undertake a program for strengthening and enriching the life of the farm family, it would find that unless it gave its moral support to these secular movements which are actively working to that end, its efforts to enlist the interest of farm people in a better family life on merely the ethical or religious plane would meet a disappointing response. One of the greatest needs of country life is to break down the barrier between the sacred and the secular and to inject religious motives and ideals into the affairs of daily life. It is useless to decry the decadence of the family altar without attempting to implant a conviction in the minds and hearts of its members that they are co-workers with God in all the work of the day which may contribute to human welfare, and therefore should together consult Him concerning their common efforts.

In the above discussion I have purposely considered those factors which make for change in the social organization of the farm family and which must be recognized and adjusted if the family is to have its rightful place in rural life. But the inference should not be drawn that the farm family is in danger of any such decadence as is so obvious in the city family. On the contrary, more general education, increased communication, better houses and household conveniences, and the better organization of farm people, will all tend to make a finer type of family life possible among an increasing proportion of farm people. Nor will there be found elsewhere a more sincere appreciation of the values of family life or a stronger devotion to them. As long as the father works within earshot of the farm bell and the whole family have some part in the farm business, as long as the mother's life is centered in her home, as long as the house and yard, the lanes and roads, the woods and dells of the old farm grip the personality as no city apartment can ever do, just so long the farm family will be the strongest social group in modern society.

The Isolated Family

BY E. H. SUTHERLAND, PH. D.*

My thesis is that isolation is a very important symptom of individual and family maladjustment, which has been scandalously neglected in social work, but which should always be carefully considered in every diagnosis and every plan of treatment.

Individuals or groups may be either isolated or in contact. Isolation and social contact are the opposite poles of the same thing. When individuals have frequent and intimate contacts they are not isolated from each other; when they do not have frequent and intimate contacts they are to that extent isolated from each other. These contacts may be impersonal, as by means of literature, or they may be personal, as by means of oral conversation or communication through any of the sense organs.

There are three important effects of isolation. First, isolation prevents the development of the distinctively human traits and abilities when the isolation is rather complete. We have authentic records of individuals who have been secluded in cellars or caves from birth or have been lost and forced to associate with lower animals. Such individuals seem to have the habits and intelligence of the lower animals, feel at home with lower animals but not with human beings, eat grass, leaves, roots, berries, bugs and raw flesh, are ignorant of all social customs and are sometimes fierce and untamable. A less extreme case of such isolation came to light last year when a girl ten years of age was admitted to an orphanage in Nebraska. When she was two years of age her mother had died; she spent the next eight years of her life on a lonely ranch in the western part of the State, where she saw practically no one except her father; he was away from home most of the day and was silent and morose when at home, seldom saying a word or paying any attention to his daughter. She was taken into this institution on the death of her father, and it was found that she had the general culture and language ability of a child three years old. But she has developed rapidly during her year in the institution. Though we do not know as much about such cases as we would like to know, it seems clear that social contacts are absolutely essential to the development of the distinctively human traits.

Second, if such traits are developed in contact with others they decay or degenerate if the individual is isolated. One of the best illustrations of this is found in the effects of solitary confinement in prison. Statements have been secured recently from some of the more intelligent prisoners by the Prison Enquiry Committee of England, from which it appears that there is characteristically the following sequence of mental changes during solitary confinement: (a) a heightening of the mental and emotional processes on entrance to the prison, (b) a determination to make the best of it by self-culture, spiritual communion, or physical development, (c) deterioration due to the inability to keep the mind concentrated on any subject and to the intrusion of obsessional tunes and images and the constant reiteration of trivialities, and

*Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Illinois, Urbana.

finally (d) general apathy and listlessness. The prisoner comes to have the outlook of a child and of course there is moral deterioration attending this. The same thing results when individuals are isolated in the far North. A man recently returned after seven years in the Yukon, during which time he had seen only two human beings for short periods. Though he was a college graduate he had found the same inability to keep his mind concentrated on any subject, the same intrusion of images or tunes and the same tendency to endless repetition of trivialities that are reported by prisoners. On his return to civilization he could not carry on a conversation, for he could not form even simple sentences, but he quickly recovered this ability.

Third, isolation causes differences in cultural development, which frequently results in the maladjustment of the individual who is transferred from one group to another. It is quite clear that differences in language are due to such isolation. In the same way customs, conventions, manners, ambitions, and ideals develop in one way in one group and in a different way in another group. The case of the Southern Mountaineers is a well known instance of such cultural differences.

Some of these cases are extreme, to be sure, and it by no means follows that the effects of moderate isolation are totally bad. There are positive advantages in a certain amount of isolation, but these are generally found when the individual, though isolated temporarily, has ready access to group life.

Isolation is produced by anything that causes exclusion from communication. It may be by geographical separation, as in the case of the southern mountaineers, by physical conditions such as color of the skin, blindness, deafness, and some kinds of stammering, but especially by cultural traits, such as differences in language, customs, manners, conventions, or ideals. Thus these differences in cultural traits which result from isolation tend to produce still more isolation. Sometimes an individual or the whole family of which he is a member is isolated by the definite intention of others because he has characteristics which they do not find congenial, such as dogmatism, conceit, irritability, bad odor, belief in socialism, manner of joking; because of these traits he is either not permitted to enter into conversation at all or the conversation is maintained on a purely formal plane. Sometimes an individual is isolated without definite intention of others, because he is uneasy in the society of others or because he is unable to compete successfully and is therefore segregated in the low-rent section of a community.

The following account shows isolation of several types. In the basement of an apartment house in a fairly well-to-do section of a city lives the janitor with his wife and a son twenty years of age. The parents were reared in the southern part of this state and there formed definite habits of work but not of personal cleanliness. The man has never learned to read and the woman, who knows how to read a little, is kept from it because her eyes are poor and she has no glasses except some purchased in a ten-cent store. Though they live in this apartment house there is a great social distance between them and the tenants and neighbors. When they first moved to this city, they lived in

the midst of the negro section, though they themselves were white, because rents were lowest there. There they were cut off from intimate association both with negroes and most whites. They do not now visit their former neighbors nor are they visited by them. The woman occasionally attends the meetings of the Salvation Army, both parents have formal contacts with their employers, they overhear snatches of conversation and they see the activities of other people; those are their only contacts. The son is quite as effectively cut off from the cultural influences of the community, but he has kept up his acquaintance with former neighbors of the negro section. Though this is not intended to be a complete diagnosis, it is sufficient to help us understand why the son has been convicted of various delinquencies and the parents have been occasionally dependent upon charitable agencies and will probably soon have to be supported entirely by others in their old age.

A family may have contacts with neighbors and still be as isolated from other great streams of cultural influences as are the southern mountaineers. I had occasion a few years ago to assist a Polish laborer from the Chicago stockyards district to get to a hospital about two miles distant, and found that since his arrival about five years before he had never previously been that far from home, that he did not know how to get back home, that he did not know that Chicago is located on Lake Michigan, that he did not know the name of the mayor of the city, or the President of the United States. Though knowledge of such things does not necessarily imply culture, its absence does imply isolation. Thomas and Znaniecki explain the murders committed by the Polish immigrant as due essentially to the fact that he feels isolated in America,—feels he is in a human wilderness, not backed by any strong social group of his own, that he has nobody and nothing but his physical strength to rely upon when provocations occur.

Thus it seems to be clear that isolation is a thing of very great significance; it is sometimes a cause of the problems that confront social workers, sometimes an effect, but it is always a symptom of maladjustment that should be carefully considered by those interested in studying or solving problems of maladjustment.

The facts of isolation have not been sufficiently considered by social workers, either in the diagnosis or treatment of maladjustments. Though we have elaborate methods for assisting the social worker to analyze such things as intelligence, health, sanitation, or efficiency of house-keeping methods, there are no devices or, at best, very crude devices, for assisting the social worker to study and solve the problem of isolation in a maladjusted individual or family. An examination of such schemes as those prepared by Miss Richmond, Dr. Healy, the Ohio Bureau of Juvenile Research, or the Whittier State School will show this inadequacy quite clearly. Of course social workers do take social contacts into account, but they also neglect them scandalously; and when they take them into account, they have no precise and consistent plan by which these can be studied thoroughly, as, for instance, health is. A question or two is asked, "Do you attend church," "Do you belong to any other organization," and there the matter is dropped.

We should have a yardstick for measuring social distances. A few

beginnings have been made towards the development of such a yardstick, such as counting the number of times during a specified period a person converses with others and the number of hours he spends in reading, which may be weighted roughly by taking into account the character of the conversation or literature. Such beginnings can be developed into more complete and enlightening devices. The problem is no more difficult than the measurement of intelligence, and the result would certainly be as significant. Until we have methods of precise measurement of social distances, every social record should contain detailed narrative accounts of the extent and nature of the isolation or the number and nature of the social contacts. These should be recorded as faithfully as items regarding health or income.

Treatment of the problems of maladjustment, also, must always be carried on with this in mind. Ambition to work, persistence in work, knowledge of methods of work, appreciation of the values protected by law, and other such attitudes can be acquired and maintained only by contact with those who have such attitudes and from these many of the dependent and delinquent are effectively isolated. We already have case workers, friendly visitors, probation officers, settlements, and other agencies, but we need a great development of less formal methods of contacts.

Cooperation Between the Home and the School

RAYMOND A. KENT, PH. D.*

The home and the school are two of our most fundamental institutions. The home is one of our oldest. It goes so far back in history that one time it did the work of the school also.

Why have these parts of our social machinery had such a long, honorable continuance? Is it because they are a part of our social traditions? Perhaps this has helped to perpetuate them. But traditions alone could not have preserved them so long a period. Is it because they are maintained with comparatively little difficulty? This certainly is not the reason. Quite the contrary, the longer they live, the greater the handicaps that beset them, apparently. This would seem to be true certainly in more recent times. Is it because we cannot find any satisfactory substitute for them? Well, partly, at least on the part of that few who are looking for substitutes.

But the fact remains that the school and the home are still the integral parts of our society that they are, because of the purposes which they serve. These purposes have their origin really not in our customs, in our *mores*, but in the needs arising out of that period which we call childhood.

The needs of this period made the family. The recognition of the necessary training during the corresponding age of the child gave rise to the simplest and most elementary forms of child training, which developed into the school system.

It is necessary for clear thinking that we see this point in bold relief. The basic reason for the home and the school are fundamentally the same. That reason is defenseless infancy and developing childhood and youth. The *child* is the factor of significance to each. The measure of the success or efficiency of each can be made in finality only in terms of its contribution to the successful preparation of the child for that period of adulthood when he will be both independent in judgment and truly social in attitude.

Looked at from this point of view, then, the home and the school are engaged in the same general project. There are certain phases of this project which clearly belong to the school, and others which quite as clearly belong to the home. Again, there are certain phases which each has a tendency to claim, and others, alas, which neither cares to own.

A characteristic feature of the lines dividing the field is that they are constantly shifting. What was clearly a function of the home a century or a half century ago, today just as clearly belongs to the school. Whoever heard of teaching "home making" in the schools fifty years ago?

The phases which each or neither claims are more distinctly social or moral in character, and less intellectual. For example, the family has asserted the right to determine the disposal of a child's time, but more and more the school has by law been given that time. The family has claimed the right to exercise its own discretion in matters affecting the physical health of the child. But more and more public opinion both through statutes and through community sentiment is clearly registering its judgment that the physical welfare of the child is a matter of increasing public importance, and as such must come in for its due share of organized, intelligent effort and supervision on the part of the public schools.

*Dr. Kent is Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Cooperation between the home and the school is partly a matter of mechanics. As such it is not at all difficult. In spite of the experience of some workers in the public school field, recent evidence supports strongly the contention that it is not generally a hard task to interest a community in its schools, and to get the cooperation and support necessary to maintain a first class school system.

It is not difficult to get a home to cooperate in teaching a child to read, or to do number work, language or anything else that the school is attempting which the home already recognizes as a proper function of the school.

It is quite a different matter when the school seeks by cooperation to secure regular attendance, elimination of tardiness, vaccination of all children, proper care of teeth, correct diet, or hygienic sleeping conditions. In at least certain of these efforts some homes claim that the school is entering their private domain. Yet cooperation here is much more important than in connection with teaching specific subjects, for the school can take care of that teaching job without the home's help much better than it can administer these matters that are less clearly intellectual in nature.

On the other hand the future—shall we say present?—success of our scheme of public education depends upon its ability to adapt itself to the ever changing needs of the children whom it should serve. Those needs may be changing in two respects. They may actually *be* different, or their existence may be a matter of only recent consciousness on our part. Cooperation between the home and the school in matters of this character are therefore more pregnant for the future than for the present. An administrator or a board in public service can no longer be autocratic. It is a great thing for a community to realize that it is being guided by a leader. It is a much greater thing for a community to realize that a part of the greatness of its leadership consists in the community's being given the credit of having intelligence, and of being asked to think and express its judgment. To secure the cooperation between the home and the school in those matters which challenge the best minds of the homes, results in creating a feeling of fair-mindedness, trust and finally, if carried on successfully over a considerable period of time, in hearty cooperation and confidence.

Between the school and the home we have spoken of the division of the field recognized as belonging mainly to each, and of those which both claim. There is a third. It is the part for which neither really wants to be responsible.

Recently in a mid-western city of under 25,000 inhabitants and with only one high school, a daily carried an announcement. It was printed over the name of the high school principal and stated that a party to be held at a designated time and place was not to be under high school supervision. Why should parents need such a notice? In this same city the same principal has been begged by many parents to have the school to do certain things for their children which these parents admit that they have not performed in lines of moral restraint.

As for the party, the principal felt forced to make the announcement because otherwise many homes would shift moral and social responsibility for results of that party to the school.

The principal is a good school administrator, does not shirk responsibility, and is a genuine Christian gentleman. He handled the matter in a thoroughly approved manner, acting as most other principals would have

acted. Yet when one measures results in terms of safeguarding adolescent youth, it seems that much was left to be desired. Because the school has formally disrobed itself of responsibility, has it really done its duty? Because the home has had a printed notice that this job belongs to it, does that guarantee a good job? If it does, obviously the notice would not have been needed.

Here is the type of situation where genuine cooperation is needed. Furthermore, it is needed more here than in either of the other two types so far discussed. If youth becomes worse instead of better, it will be partly because of just such a lack of pulling together as this case illustrates.

What can be done? The attempt to answer this will not be in terms of a single case, but of a policy or program. The statement is not one of a theory only. In its most important features it has been successfully tried.

First, we must remember that it is the child and his welfare which are at stake. Second, we are now concerned with a field where the demarcation between the responsibility of the home and that of the school is not clear. Third, these agencies may need the assistance of other agencies such as the church.

The program itself consists in determining: (1) just what the needs of the child are, or what training is to be given him; and (2) what agency is to give him the training. Procedure is to get together, from the Parent-Teachers Association, let us say, an intelligent, conscientious group of people who are willing to spend time and real study upon the problem. This group should make a specific outline of the instructional needs of high school boys and girls in social and religious development. It is assumed that the intellectual development is already assured by what the school is doing. With the outline in hand, the next step is to allocate to school, home, church, and all other responsible agencies, the specific developments for which they may reasonably be held.

The final step is to get the desired action on the part of each. Ordinarily this is the most difficult part of the accomplishment. Under this plan it is at least easier because it is the last step in a series. It represents a reasonable action based upon a well thought out program, stated, not *ex cathedra*, but after cooperative study. Definite accomplishment now stands as a challenge, not as a mere interesting invitation.

SUMMARY

The home and school, though two separate institutions, exist to make significant contributions to the development of the individual during childhood. Cooperation is most necessary to effect those services for the child which are demanded by the rapid and significant changes taking place in the social and recreational as well as in the education and home life of youth. It is also most difficult to achieve here.

It is easiest to secure and less valuable in connection with those services which are commonly acknowledged to belong to the school.

The most significant goal to be set through cooperation is not goodwill, confidence or unified action, excellent as these are. It is the immeasurable advantage that comes to any community which is able to think earnestly and intelligently as a unit and as a result act so that *all* the necessary major safeguards and educational needs of childhood and youth will be reasonably well guaranteed.

An Unsectarian Religion for Our Schools

ELLA LYMAN CABOT*

"We say that human life is mean, but how did we find out that it was mean?" wrote Emerson in *The Oversoul*. "What is the ground of this uneasiness of ours; of the old discontent? What is the universal sense of want and ignorance but the fine innuendo by which the soul makes its enormous claim?"

Since the war many Americans have been saying that much in our national life is mean, selfish, lawless, even brutal. There is truth in what they say. We cannot look into the year that brought the appalling murders at Herrin (to name one instance alone) without discouragement and shame. But it is when our condemnation is rife and apparently justified that we need most of all to remember Emerson's question, "How did we find out that human life was mean?" Surely because we have a standard of comparison, because there is within us and beyond us a light that makes the surrounding darkness black as pitch. As long as we are capable of being shocked by the lawlessness, frivolity, cruelty and self interest that exist around us, we are guided still by a light that may lead us out of their entanglement. But that light must burn as well as shine. To condemn wrong is not enough: we must condemn it to death and carry out the sentence.

Where then does our awareness of existing evils lead us—that is the question. It may lead in three directions: to indifference, to "normalcy," or to radical reform. The road to indifference is often followed by two contrasting groups, the over-sensitive and the over-busy. They harden their hearts that they may not suffer; they occupy their hours that they may not think. Evil doing goes on unscathed, unconverted. But normalcy is also, I believe, a dangerous ideal. People who have lived through the agony of a world war, followed by pestilence and starvation, ought not to return to the exact spot they were in before, ought not to treat the past like a fever from which they have in due time been restored to health. They ought not to be the same as they were; they ought to be different; they ought to dig deeper, to stretch the roots of their convictions over wider ground.

It is because I dread a return to "normalcy" that I make this program for something that may direct us along a third path, the path that Washington and Lincoln would have us follow. I offer a program sure to be combatted at first, but not only compatible with but expressive of our national ideal. I maintain that all public school teaching should be deliberately and avowedly grounded on the two great commandments: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy strength and with all thy mind," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

"Religion in our public schools! Impossible, quite impossible!" I hear you say. Well, for years I too accepted the common view that it is an impossible program. Now I have come to believe, not only

*Mrs. Cabot is Vice-President of the Religious Education Association, and also a member of the Massachusetts State Board of Education.

that it is possible, but none other can permanently redeem us as a nation.

Let me state my proposition in a compact form. The first commandment embodies the essence of religion; the second gives the application of religion through ethics. Anyone who tries to live by them will find himself fully occupied, and startlingly changed. But first how is such teaching compatible with religious liberty? Secondly, how in general can it be taught? And thirdly, how will it lift the immense weight of crime, frivolity, self-indulgence, graft, lawlessness, and recklessness under which our nation suffers? These three questions I want to answer. It is impossible in a single article to do more than this, but if my position is accepted I am ready with the help of many wiser than I, to work out a program.

I.

How is public school teaching based on the two great commandments compatible with the religious liberty embedded in the Constitution of the United States?

To my mind the words religious liberty themselves suggest the first point in answer. Our ancestors came here for *religious* liberty, not for liberty alone. To be free is always to be free to do something in particular. The liberty the Puritans desired was to worship God in their own way—not just freedom but freedom to worship—not liberty alone but religious as well as political liberty, was what they sought. Not only did many of the first comers choose our country because they wanted freedom to be religious in their own way, but sect after sect has since come to America to escape religious persecution.

Far more important than these early immigrants is, however, the fact that an appeal to God for help and the recognition of God as judge is embedded in our constitution and in all our important ceremonies. In my own State the election of a governor or the proclamation of Thanksgiving is announced with the words: "God save the Commonwealth of Massachusetts." "I solemnly swear that I will support the Constitution of the United States * * * so help me God." Every federal or state or city officer appeals in his oath, solemn in intention even if carelessly used in practice, to God. Every voter in Massachusetts (and every citizen over twenty-one is now a potential voter) takes his pledge in the recognized presence of God.

We are then a *religion-recognizing* nation, very different in that respect from the French who are shocked by mention of the name of God in politics. That this recognition of religion is far more than perfunctory is shown when on great occasions our highest statesmen appeal to God and the nation breathes deep in response. When we feel strongly we want someone to speak for our ultimate need, resolve, and hope; to call on God. So Lincoln struggled to make sure "not whether God was on our side, during the Civil War, but whether we were on God's side." So Wilson proclaiming war against Germany used for the United States almost the words of Luther: "God helping her" (he said of America) "she can no other." So Harding at the opening of the conference on Limitation of Armament said the Lord's

prayer. One more great saying of Lincoln's, not sufficiently noticed among the abundance of his wit and wisdom, illustrates further the religious yet undogmatic quality of many of our greatest statesmen. When asked to what church he belonged Lincoln answered: "If any church takes as its creed the two great commandments, that church will I join with all my heart." A characteristic answer this of our Bible-saturated President, hunter for the will of God, lover through persistent abuse of all his enemies.

But it is not alone on momentous or formal occasions that religious phrases are accepted and approved. Of the three most popular national songs two, *America* and *The Battle Hymn of the Republic*, are saturated with religion. Even the third, *The Star Spangled Banner* ends with—this be our motto, In God Do We Trust. Miss Bates' *America the Beautiful*, also proclaims the first and second commandments.

We are a religion-recognizing nation. That is my first thesis. Different as may be to each of us the meaning of the word God, yet the name of God is familiar to every school-child, is sung at every patriotic meeting; is called on by every voter and office-holder in the United States.

But though we call for God's help in carrying out our oath to keep the laws, to speak the truth and nothing but the truth, yet as a nation we are not law-abiding, not invincibly honest. Recognizing religion we act irreligiously and in contradiction to our own oath. A nation cannot long endure half lawless and half honest. What ought we to do? Let the teachers of the United States be taught, teach and learn to live by the two great commandments.

I have tried to show that there is no valid objection on the ground of religious liberty to the teaching of the first commandment in our public schools. As for the second commandment, no one objects to its precept however much he slinks out of living by it. Two points seem to me significant here. Notice that we are dealing with commandments not with creeds: commandments that involve difficult action. Notice also that these two commandments come direct from Jewish Scriptures and are quoted by Christ as the standard for everyone of his followers. There is no Jew or Christian of any denomination who does not accept these two commandments. Nor is this all. The first commandment reads: "Thou shalt love the Lord *thy* God." Not God as worshipped by anyone else, but God in whom you yourself believe. Therefore the parents of all children in the schools, even including Buddhists, Chinese, Japanese, could accept the duties of utter loyalty to the God they recognize and the neighbor they are bound to serve.

There remain the atheist and those indifferent to religion. Of the indifferent let me only say that they need to be made different. The atheists who are I believe few, should of course be taken seriously. But if we are a religion-recognizing nation, then they are the exception and should be treated as such. The Quakers and all who as a matter of religion held pacifist principles were excused from military service in the Great War. So to the confirmed atheists we should say: You are excused from religious teaching in the schools because you are exceptional. But our faiths, our customs, our duties as a nation remain.

We not only worship, but we teach our children to worship and serve the Lord their God.

II.

But even if we agree that these two commandments should be and essentially are accepted as valid for all believers, there remain strong objections to their being taught in the public schools. The first and very important difficulty is this: There are few teachers capable of teaching religion. In teaching the first commandment, who among our grade teachers would dare take the responsibility of defining the nature of God in a way to content the parents of all her pupils? What can she then do?

Turn again to the religious history of our nation. Our Presidents have been remarkably free from sectarianism, but they have thought of God as their source of strength, their helper in time of need, the life of the world, the light-bringer in perplexity, our Father in whom is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever and ever. The teachers in our public schools will not often be called on by their pupils to define God. Children do not ask for definitions of God. They ask what He does. But if any question arises, there before our teachers lie the public sayings of Washington, of Franklin, of Lincoln, of McKinley, of Wilson, of Harding, as well as the accepted wisdom of our poets, Whittier, Lowell, Bryant, Longfellow. Do not the children in our public schools already, though too casually, gain an idea of God through learning Bryant's *Waterfowl*, Lowell's *Present Crisis*, Mrs. Hemans' *Pilgrim Fathers*, as well as through Lincoln's *Second Inaugural*?

Let me now take up the second commandment. Could the average public school teacher convey that message to her class without, shall I say, boring them? Personally I believe that most teachers would be immensely relieved to find that the precepts they are now trying to shove down children's throats by advice and reprimand could be taught as the creed of the school and illustrated by a wide range of material chosen from literature and history. "Do be kind to little Tom." "Don't snatch the chalk from Jack." "Give Mary one of your buns." Feebly or forcibly every teacher tries to make children realize the existence of their neighbors. But if our schools write this commandment over their lintels and if methods of teaching were supplied in our normal schools, very soon the pith of history, story, anecdote, poetry, example, practice would be brought to the teacher's command. Ethics would be a part of the curriculum, but far more than that it would be taught through every subject and every activity of the school.

I expect of course to meet not only the objection, "It can't be done," but the objection, "It is done already." These two contradictory objections go forward hand in hand like Tweedledee and Tweedledum, the one saying "Done" and the other "Can't be done."

Yes, something of these two great commandments has been taught by parents and teachers, but not in any nation-wide way and not yet effectively. For four thousand years Judaism and Christianity have uttered that simple sounding, moderate command, to love our neighbor as oneself. Yet looking about for a sect that has learned it, we see only a very little one, whose language is yea, nay, whose garb is sim-

plicity, whose practice through the war they detested was uncomplaining service, those who are Friends to the end. The Quakers, who almost alone among sects are universally trusted in Europe, show what can come from the creed of loving your neighbor as yourself.

III.

Now imagine that code backed by our entire nation, pushed forward in our schools as the universal and official belief. What results could we expect? First, an enormous gain in energy and in standards of achievement, due to the impulse of the first commandment. How could it not greatly help our children if they learned to do anything with all their hearts, their soul, their strength, their mind? Is there anything they take up now with fullness of resolve and carry to the finish except athletic games? "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might." I know a very few who live by that creed. Those few listen, they learn, they carry through, they are so exceptional that they inevitably succeed. The few who *care* intensely and right to the end,—how quickly they advance.

Our present standards of school work enfeeble. Teachers and pupils expect not perfection but a "passing" mark; not all thy mind and heart and strength but "getting by." The teaching of the first commandment would push toward one hundred percent instead of sixty percent. One great gain from the enforcement of the second commandment would be an increase in sympathetic imagination. Few of us feel our neighbor as real as ourselves. His toothache does not depress me like my own. When he loses a train I take it quite calmly; the humor of his sprawling on the ice is funny; my fall is pathetic. The first lesson in loving our neighbor as ourselves is, as Josiah Royce wrote long ago, to realize him as ourself, for selfishness is illusion.

It is a stupendous claim that the burdens of our corrupt national life would roll away if all nations learned to love their neighbor one half as well as themselves. Illness would remain, and poverty, earthquake and pestilence, disappointment and deformity and the shattering blows of death. But war would end, because greed and hatred would end. Germany did not love France as herself, not Austria Serbia, nor the Turks the Armenians. Business war (falsely so-called) would end, if the mine owners loved the miners as themselves, and the strikers loved the strikebreakers as themselves. Mistress and maid, farmer and consumer, would have one aim. Goods would, as my farmer says (and he practices both commandments already) be "made on honor." The rich man seeing that prohibition helps the poor would cease drinking.

"Too much to expect of human nature," you say. And yet I have faith that human nature would like it if it tried it. Experience goes that way. Look for happy faces. You do not find them among self-seekers and grafters. You find them in your devoted Irish maid-servant, in doctors who are good physicians, and most of all in mothers bending over cradles. Happiness when it lasts is linked to unselfishness.

Greatness, too, at its highest pitch, seeks men who love their God with all their strength and men who love their neighbors as themselves. H. G. Wells has lately given a list of the six greatest men in history.* He defines greatness as enduring influence. The first he named is

Jesus; the second Buddha; the third Asoka (I regret to say I had never heard of him before!) was a disciple of Buddha's who worked with keen intelligence for the welfare of his people; the fourth he names is Aristotle, the fifth Roger Bacon, the sixth Abraham Lincoln. Another student of history would make a different list, but not, I believe, an essentially different one. The greatest men in human history will still be those who seeking to further the kingdom of God pay no heed to their own advancement; those moved by the suffering of their people and unable to endure their wrongs; prophets, philosophers, freers of slaves. We miss in Wells' list any great writer, but if one only could be chosen, the sayings of Jesus are more potent than the sayings of Dante or of Shakespeare. We miss great conquerors: Darius, Alexander, Caesar, Napoleon; but their work passes. As we look back at the stream of world-conquerors, they are like waves, each has his high tide and then recedes. Scientists, philosophers, lovers of God and man remain. Those who conquer the world fail, those who overcome the world succeed.

One autumn day, just before the heavy frosts, I found my little niece kneeling beside the garden-bed patting the flowers that soon must die. "Go down to your roots, little plants," I heard her say. It is a message for America, now reawakening from the winter of her discontent. Go down to your roots, uneasy nation.

*The American Magazine for July, 1922.

The Problem and the Opportunity of Educating the Near East Orphans

BY JOHN RALPH VORIS*

During its six years of ministry, Near East Relief has been primarily that which the words of its chartered name signify, an organization for the relief of the destitute. Yet in the midst of this emergency service, as a result of obligation thrust upon it rather than as a preconceived goal, it has gradually developed a program and a policy of education and it has visualized a great need and opportunity.

In spite of the wars, famines, political upheavals, and removals of children, centering attention upon emergency relief; despite the lack of educational equipment, teachers, budget, program and policy, the children have received some training. They have been given industrial tasks, which, assisting in their self-support, have been also a training in habits of work, self-control and discipline. They have learned to play. They have been given oral training in such elemental facts of history, language, folklore and religion as the young teachers of their own race could give to them. They have had services of worship with some regularity and, here and there, Sunday School lessons by seasoned teachers.

Four factors have combined to make these educational blossoms grow out of a desert: the large number of missionaries of the American (Congregational) and the Presbyterian Boards in the Near East; Near East Relief personnel who have been missionaries, teachers, Christian Association or social workers; the hundreds of native young people, working for food relief, who are the products of former American schools in the Levant; and last, and most important, the native aptitude and eagerness for an education.

And yet, compared with the needs the development has been pathetically inadequate. Unless something is done on a big scale, the children are going out unfitted for the highest leadership so desperately needed,—leadership of which they might be made capable.

I need not point out to those who read these pages that it is unspeakably wasteful to save these children from death, and then fail to prepare them for self-support, and a life of usefulness; nor argue for the necessity of an equipment, program of education, a budget and a personnel.

If Near East Relief is to undertake this task, it will need the sympathy and assistance of those who see and believe in this constructive program, both to create an adequate overseas plan, and to hold the interest of the American people in the program adopted.

Let me state briefly the overseas task:

Certain theoretical considerations are elemental. The children must respect their own nationality and desire to retain their best inheritance and to serve their own people. They must be taught to speak their native tongue and to worship in their native faith. At the same time, they should be given the best elements of western civilization. This is but the charter of life for the orphans.

But to carry out such a program involves us at once in some of the most baffling questions imaginable. If there are fewer opportunities for world service so alluring, so there are surely fewer fields so perplexing.

Take for example the question of nationality and language. We have eight thousand Armenian orphans in Greece and as many in Syria. Shall

*Mr. Voris is Associate General Secretary and Director of Church Relations, Near East Relief.

they be trained to be "Armenian" in tongue, thought and hope? Surely. But if so what will be their future in Greece or Syria?

The Armenians in Greece must clearly be taught Greek as well as Armenian. But shall they be taught Russian with the thought they will eventually be placed in Russian Armenia. Shall the Armenians in Syria be taught Arabic, or French or Turkish, or Russian as well as Armenian?

Take the problem of institutionalizing the children. Dr. R. R. Reeder, a well known American child-welfare expert who has been the leading spirit in Serbian child-welfare work, will visit the Near East orphanages this winter after finishing his task in Serbia. He will advise the Near East Relief as to its child placing program.

In common with most social welfare exponents, Dr. Reeder proceeds on the basis that a poor home is better than a good institution. But he will be confronted in the Near East with the problem of thousands of children living either in a foreign environment or amid a local population so depleted it will be difficult to find homes in which to place the children without endangering their health and very existence. Take the problem of elementary and industrial education. Dr. Paul Monroe of Teachers' College, Columbia, has just sailed to spend four or five months to make a survey of our orphanage educational developments and to project a program for the future. He faces not only the language problem already indicated, but the complex question of creating a program for Greek, Syrian, Armenian and Georgian children with their different tongues and needs, with few text books extant and a reasonable desire on the part of national governments to control the education of children within their boundaries.

But if these educational questions are difficult, the problem of religious education is more so.

We deal, for the most part, with children of Armenian Georgian, Greek Orthodox, and Protestant faiths, and in addition with a few thousands of Roman Catholic, a few hundred Jewish, and a very few Moslem children. Strange mixture!

It is self-evident that these children must be brought up in the faiths of their fathers. It is also obvious that the larger number will have but little actual training therein except as Near East Relief provides the way, assisting native church workers and supplementing their work with help from the American Churches.

Here, therefore, is the opportunity that faces us now—never to come again—the most interesting experiment in religious education in the world today—viz., to assist the native Eastern Church leadership to give to their orphaned children the full elements of native faith, worship, ritual, theological conceptions, hymnology—and to so supplement this, where permitted to do so, with daily training in the ethical, social and evangelistic ideals of the Western churches as to create an amalgamated program.

We are setting about this task with the greatest care. We are securing the advice and active assistance of all constituencies concerned. An official committee, representative of the American religious education forces as well as of missionary and native church groups, will be requested to recommend the program.

This deserves, and if it is to succeed, must have the thoughtful assistance of educators. It is still a prophecy rather than a definite policy. So long as the financial problems are so critical and the appeal for hungry Greek children so urgent, it will be but little other than a hope.

The Christian Ideal of Family Life as Expounded in Horace Bushnell's "Christian Nurture"

LUTHER A. WEIGLE, PH.D.*

The modern movement for the better religious education of children owes more to Horace Bushnell, doubtless, than to any other one man. His "Christian Nurture" was in sober truth an epoch-making book. In it he sharply criticized the extreme individualism, the reliance upon emotional revivals, and the one-sided supernaturalism which had characterized the thought and practice of American churches throughout the second half of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries; and he vindicated for childhood its normal place in the Kingdom of God, and for the family its function as the instrument, by God's grace, of Christian nurture.

A life-time of experience went into the writing of this book. As a young pastor and a father, he began to face the problem early in his ministry at the North Church in Hartford. In 1838 he published an essay on "Spiritual Economy of Revivals of Religion," and six years later another entitled "Growth, not Conquest, the True Method of Christian Progress." He was invited, in 1846, to discuss the subject before the ministerial Association of which he was a member. The two "Discourses on Christian Nurture" which he delivered in response to this invitation were published by the Massachusetts Sabbath School Society; but the publication was suspended and the book withdrawn from sale a few months later, because of the hue and cry it aroused. Bushnell himself then republished the "Discourses" in 1847, together with a spirited "Argument" in their defence, the two earlier essays, and two sermons upon related themes. Finally, in 1861, he wrote the book upon the subject which remains a classic in its field.

When Bushnell began his ministry, the prevalent theology was, in temper and spirit, a heritage from the "Great Awakening" of 1740-42, under the powerful preaching of Jonathan Edwards and George Whitefield. Doctrines akin to theirs had crystallized into an orthodoxy, which found its most characteristic and influential expression in Dr. Samuel Hopkins' "System of Divinity"; and the corresponding practices had become established in habit as the custom and expectation of the churches, through successive waves of emotional religious revival. Great emphasis was laid upon the dogmas of original sin and total depravity. Man's inability was his most discussed attribute; and it was held that even the prayers of unconverted folk render them odious in the sight of God, for these are manifestations of their self-love. One's only hope lies in a conversion and self-surrender so complete as to involve a willingness to be damned for the glory of God. Yet no one can make this surrender of his own will, nor by any striving experience conversion. It is the gift of God to those to whom he pleases to grant it; it is entirely the work of the Holy Spirit. There are no "means of grace," strictly speaking, for no human action or desire can make a soul one whit more sure of ultimate possession of the regenerating grace of God. These old

*Horace Bushnell Professor of Christian Nurture, Yale University.

New Englanders took in sober earnest the text which likens the Spirit to the wind—"thou can'st not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth." There was nothing for them to do except to undertake to realize their lost condition and to hope that God might choose, in His own good time, to grant them his converting grace. This grace manifested itself usually in seasons of revival; yet even revival meetings could not be planned for and "put on," as some of the itinerant revivalists of the present seem to think; they might be desired and prayed for, but their coming depended wholly upon the will of God.

There was no hesitation about applying these principles to children. They, too, were held to be lost in sin, depraved by nature, and in need of a wholly new heart. They were children of wrath until the Holy Spirit should transmute them into children of God. It mattered nothing what their parentage, or what the quality of the home in which they were brought up. All alike, whether the children of Christian parents or of open sinners, were considered to be partakers of the common heritage of guilt and alien to the Kingdom of God, until such time as He should grant them a new birth. Older folk can do nothing for them, then, save to seek to deepen in them a sense of their need, and to pray on their behalf for the gift of conversion.

That these statements are not overdrawn, let the following letter, written by a twelve-year-old boy, bear witness:

"Though I am thus well in body yet I question whether my soul doth prosper as my body doth, for I perceive yet to this very day, little *growth* in grace; and this makes me question whether grace be in my heart or no. I feel also daily great unwillingness to good duties and the great ruling of sin in my heart; and that God is angry with me and gives me no answers to my prayers; but many times he even throws them down as dust in my face; and he does not grant my continued request for the *spiritual blessing of the softening of my hard heart*. And in all this I could yet take some comfort, but that it makes me to wonder what God's *secret decree* concerning me may be: for I doubt whether even God is wont to deny grace and mercy to his chosen (though *uncalled*) when they seek unto him by prayer for it; and therefore, seeing he doth thus deny it to me, I think that the reason of it is most likely to be because I belong not unto the *election of grace*. I desire that you would let me have your prayers as I doubt not but I have them, and rest

Your Son, SAMUEL MATHER."

"Even God"—there is something pathetic about that phrase. The boy's use of the word "even" is a revelation of what he had been taught concerning the arbitrariness of God!

Bushnell dissented from this dismal theology at a good many points. In the end, he broke its power. His influence was that of an emancipator. It has been well said that he rendered to the evangelical churches of New England four great services. He helped to deliver them (1) from a revivalism which ignored the quiet and constant processes of Christian nurture and growth; (2) from a conception of miracle which identified it with the contradiction or suspension of natural law; (3)

from a doctrine of the Trinity which was practically equivalent to tritheism; (4) from views of the Atonement which were out of relation to the laws of human moral experience.

Yet Dr. Bushnell was not primarily a theologian. He was not concerned to make disciples or to construct a system. He was not interested in theology for its own sake. He was, first and always, a minister of the gospel of Christ, a preacher and a pastor. He faced these great problems because he met them as practical issues in his ministry, and he could not rest satisfied with any solution short of the truth, gotten at first hand, in concrete touch with human experience.

The first of these practical problems that he met, as a young minister, was what attitude he should take toward the current practice of reliance upon revivals of religion. His decision involved a re-study of a good many assumptions of the traditional orthodoxy—assumptions concerning original sin, conversion, the means of grace, the status of children, and the influence of family life. And this study led on to the further problem of the relation of the natural and the supernatural in human experience.

His experience as a minister led him to distrust revivals, in spite of the measure of value in them which he did not deny; and to trust the influences of family life in a Christian home. He could not believe that emotional excitement is necessary to conversion, or that it is a test of religious character; and he could not believe that the influences of family life make no difference within the child or in the sight of God. Grant if we will that revivals are needed for old sinners, for the conversion of the children of Christian homes we may rely upon Christian nurture.

"I see great reason," he wrote in 1847, "to distrust the manner of testing religious character, generally prevalent. We make nothing of habit, nothing of a proposed aim of life connected with Christian duties, but we demand a kind of religious experience that stands in marked contrast with the previous time, particularly in regard to feelings of complacency toward God. For it is assumed that, if any man can express the fact that he has found great emotions of delight in God or the character of God, he is of course a true disciple. And yet nothing is more common than to find the most ecstatic flights of experience, in this particular, and, within a very few months, a total indifference to religion, and a manifest abandonment of every duty. . . . My own experience as a pastor has compelled me to feel that, if a young person or child comes to me, in a time of religious quiet, and simply asks to be admitted as a disciple to the ordinances, disclosing a habit of private devotion, declaring a serious purpose and desire to live a religious life, and indicating a settled spirit of *dependence on God for the sustenance of all good exercises*, I have a far better and more reliable evidence of Christian character, than any sudden burst of ecstatic emotion towards God can possibly yield. These, too, as experience will abundantly show, are the persons who maintain the best examples of piety afterwards. We see, too, in such examples, that the more closely piety is wedded to habit, and the more thoroughly it is interwoven with common life, the healthier and firmer is the growth. It wants not great experiences to make great Christians. Between ecstatic flights and godly lives there

is no valid connection. But when the spirit of God sanctifies the table and the hearth, and makes homes temples of piety to childhood, when newness of life begins with education or nurture, and not in high scenes or explosive changes, then the church of God, growing up, like a nation or empire, from a silent law of increase in its own nature, becomes a compact organic frame, having the vital spirit, as it is the body of Christ Himself."

Following these considerations, Bushnell was led to formulate what he calls the true idea or principle of Christian education in these terms: "*The child is to grow up a Christian, and never know himself as being otherwise.*" "In other words," he goes on to explain, "the aim, effort and expectation should be, not, as is commonly assumed, that the child is to grow up in sin, to be converted after he comes to a mature age; but that he is to open on the world as one that is spiritually renewed, not remembering the time when he went through a technical experience, but seeming rather to have loved what is good from his earliest years."

He defends this thesis with a wealth of argument which rests ultimately upon three main propositions:

(1) Christianity rests upon the covenant promises of God; and God's covenant, in both the Old and the New Testament, is with families, rather than with individuals merely.

(2) The nature of the family, as a social group, is such that the spirit and character of the parents inevitably influence the life and character of the children.

(3) The life of the family may thus be a means of grace; it affords an instrument which God may use for the fulfillment of His promise and is a natural channel for the power of the Holy Spirit.

These three propositions we must examine more closely.

1. *God's covenant with the family.* Bushnell never tires of quoting from the Scriptures, both of the Old and the New Testament, texts to prove that God deals with His children by families. And he incorporates in his doctrine of Christian nurture that peculiarly rich and noble feature of the Hebrew religion—its ideal of family life. "The whole course of revelation, both in the Old and New Testament, is tinged by associations, and sprinkled over with expressions that recognize the religious unity of families, and the inclusion of the children with the parents. All the promises run—'to you and to your children'; for Peter's language here is only an inspired transfer and reassertion of the Jewish family ideas at the earliest moment, in the field of Christianity, itself. It recognizes that Christianity is just what we know it to be, nothing but a continuation and fuller development of the old religion. It widens out the scope of the old religion, so as to include all nations, even as the prophets foretold; and raises all the rites and symbols into a higher spiritual sense, as they were appointed from the first to be raised. Taken altogether, the old and the new constitute a perfect whole or system, and the process is neither more nor less than God's way of developing and authenticating a universal religion. In this universal religion, therefore, we are to look for the continuance onward of the old family character and the inclusive oneness of fathers with their children."

2. *The organic unity of the family.* This is the central point in

Bushnell's argument. If his position here be unsound, his whole doctrine of Christian nurture fails. Fortunately, this is the feature of his theory which is most easily verified, and the whole trend of modern psychology and sociology confirms the essential truth of his view. The point is so important that we must quote more fully here than elsewhere.

"If we narrowly examine the relation of parent and child, we shall not fail to discover something like a law of organic connection, as regards character, subsisting between them. Such a connection as makes it easy to believe, and natural to expect, that the faith of the one will be propagated in the other. Perhaps I should rather say, such a connection as induces the conviction that the character of the one is actually included in that of the other, as a seed is formed in the capsule; and being there matured, by a nutriment derived from the stem, is gradually separated from it. It is a singular fact that many believe substantially the same thing in regard to evil character, but have no thought of any such possibility in regard to good. There has been much speculation, of late, as to whether a child is born in depravity, or whether the depraved character is superinduced afterwards. But, like many other great questions, it determines much less than is commonly supposed; for, according to the most proper view of the subject, a child is really not born until he emerges from the infantile state, and never before that time can he be said to receive a separate and properly individual nature. . . . The child, after birth, is still within the matrix of the parental life, and will be, more or less, for many years. And the parental life will be flowing into him all that time, just as naturally, and by a law as truly organic, as when the sap of a trunk flows into a limb."

"In maintaining the organic unity of the family, I mean to assert that a power is exerted by parents over children, not only when they teach, encourage, persuade and govern, but without any purposed control whatever. The bond is so intimate that they do it unconsciously and undesignedly—they must do it. Their character, feelings, spirit and principles must propagate themselves, whether they will or not . . . in the same way as if the effect accrued under the law of simple contagion. . . . We conceive the manners, personal views, prejudices, practical motives and spirit of the house as an atmosphere which passes into all and pervades all, as naturally as the air they breathe. . . . Sometimes the child, passing into the sphere of other causes, as in the school, the church, neighboring families, or general society, will emerge and take a character partially distinct—partially, I say; never wholly. The odor of the house will always be in his garments, and the internal difficulties with which he has to struggle will spring of the family seeds planted in his nature."

"The child is open to impressions from everything he sees. His character is forming under a principle, not of choice, but of nurture. The spirit of the house is breathed into his nature, day by day. The anger and gentleness, the fretfulness and patience—the appetites, passions and manners—all the variant modes of feeling exhibited round him, pass into him as impressions, and become seeds of character in him, not because the parents will, but because it must be so whether they will or not. They propagate their own evil in the child, not by design, but under a law of moral infection."

It is interesting to note the varied figures of speech whereby Bushnell seeks to express the fact that the character of the parents tends to reproduce itself in the character of the child. He speaks not only of "spirit" and "atmosphere," but of "contagion," "infection," "the odor of the house," "seeds" and "sap." Less figurative, and even more convincing when one reflects upon it, is his statement that no child is fully born when his little body emerges from the womb, for his mental, moral and spiritual being is still in process of birth, held in the matrix of the family life and molded by its influences quite as really as his physical being had been held and shaped by the life of the mother.

The essential truth of this position is being abundantly established by modern psychological and sociological investigations of group behavior, of child development, and of the factors contributing to nervous disorganization, mental disease and moral delinquency. In evidence there may be cited such practical studies as Breckenridge and Abbott's "The Delinquent Child and the Home," and psychological treatises such as McDougall's "Introduction to Social Psychology" and "The Group Mind," together with the new emphasis upon the impressions of childhood and upon the importance of what has come to be called the unconscious mind, which characterizes the work of psychoanalysts, whether they be of the strictly Freudian school or not.

3. *The family a means of grace.* Dr. Bushnell had no quarrel with the idea that human nature has been corrupted by sin. He agreed that man is of his own strength unable to realize the possibilities of good that lie before him by the grace of God; and he believed that man's supreme need is for the converting, regenerating power of the Spirit of God. But he held that the current views put undue and unreal limitation upon the work of the Divine Spirit. God's hand is not shortened, that He can not save except at revival meetings; His Spirit is not bound, so that He can not use the natural laws and forces which He has ordained. Rather should we expect to find in these natural laws and forces the accustomed instruments of God's working upon the lives of men; they constitute the wonted channels for the empowering inflow of the Holy Spirit.

"My child is a sinner, you will say; and how can I expect him to begin a right life, until God gives him a new heart? . . . Who then has told you that a child can not have the new heart of which you speak? Whence do you learn that if you live the life of Christ, before him and with him, the law of the Spirit of Life may not be such as to include and quicken him also? . . . Take any scheme of depravity you please, there is yet nothing in it to forbid the possibility that a child should be led, in his first moral act, to cleave unto what is good and right, any more than in the first of his twentieth year. . . . And what more appropriate to the doctrine of spiritual influence itself, than to believe that as the Spirit of Jehovah fills all the worlds of matter, and holds a presence of power and government in all objects, so all human souls, the infantile as well as the adult, have a nurture of the Spirit appropriate to their age and their wants?"

"Christian piety should begin in other and milder forms of exercise than those which commonly distinguish the conversion of adults; Christ himself, by that renewing Spirit who can sanctify from the womb, should be practically infused into the childish mind; in other words, the house, having a domestic Spirit of grace dwelling in it, should become the church of childhood, the table and hearth a holy rite, and life an element of saving power. Something is wanted that is better than teaching, something that transcends mere effort and will-work—the loveliness of a good life, the repose of faith, the confidence of righteous expectation, the sacred and cheerful liberty of the Spirit—all glowing about the young soul, as a warm and genial nurture, and forming in it, by methods that are silent and imperceptible, a spirit of duty and religious obedience to God."

"Never is it too early for good to be communicated. Infancy and childhood are the ages most pliant to good. . . . A right spirit may be virtually exercised in children, when, as yet, it is not intellectually received, or as a form of doctrine. . . . Nay, the operative truth necessary to a new life may possibly be communicated through and from the parent, being revealed in his looks, manners and ways of life, before they are of an age to understand the teaching of words, for the Christian scheme, the gospel, is really wrapped up in the life of every Christian parent, and beams out from him as a living epistle, before it escapes from the lips or is taught in words. And the Spirit of truth may as well make this living truth effectual as the preaching of the gospel itself."

These are the main points of Dr. Bushnell's theory respecting the relation of children to the grace of God, and the place of the family as the instrument of Christian nurture. One is tempted to linger in exposition of the theological implications of this theory, which Bushnell brings out with characteristic vigor and clearness. Assenting to the idea of original sin, he holds that the passing on of sin from generation to generation is not so much a matter of physiological heredity as of environmental influence and social heredity. And he insists that whatever laws are operative to establish evil in the life of successive generations, operate also to establish and propagate good. We might speak of "original good" in the same sense and for the same reasons as we speak of "original sin." He holds that infant baptism is an empty and unintelligible rite except upon the basis of the principles of Christian nurture described above. He believes that children should be recognized as members of the Christian church, born into its heritage and covenanted for by their parents; that they should thus grow up within the Christian church, not outside of it, just as they grow up within the republic; and that in due time, when the Spirit of God moves them, they should take upon themselves the full and responsible vows of discipleship, not as aliens to be assimilated, but as children of the Kingdom, now grown to maturity.

Upon the basis of the theory of Christian nurture thus expounded, Dr. Bushnell devotes the second part of the book to practical counsels concerning the training of children in the Christian family. To come down to details is always perilous; but he does it successfully. This part of the book reflects the experience of a father as well as the con-

victions of a Christian minister. It is as concrete as any of the better books of today on child-training; and it has more body and substance than many of them, because its counsels are underlaid by a consistent philosophy of life and of religion, instead of being a mere collection of devices that have chanced to work.

Christian nurture begins, Bushnell asserts, even before birth, in all that affects the character of parents, and renders them fit, in body and mind, for parenthood. "It is a great mistake to suppose that men and women, such as are to be fathers and mothers, are affected only in their souls by religious experience, and not in their bodies." Bushnell asserted the unity of the psycho-physical organism, and propounded a doctrine of Christian eugenics, long before these terms came into use.

After birth, "the nurture of the soul and character is to begin just when the nurture of the body begins." Indeed, one of the most interesting and suggestive chapters of the book is that entitled "Physical Nurture, to Be a Means of Grace." "So intimate is the connection of mind and body," it begins, "so very close to real oneness are they, that no one can, by any possibility, be a Christian in his mind, and not be in some sense a Christian in his body. If his soul is to be a temple of the Holy Ghost, then his body must be. If his soul is under government, then his body will be. And if his body is not under government, then his soul, by no possibility, can be; save that, in every such case, it will and must be under the government of the body; subject to its power, swayed by all its excesses and distempers." In the light of this general principle, Bushnell points out the moral and religious implications of the habits of eating, exercise and dress into which children are permitted to fall; and finds in such matters as the regularity with which a baby is fed, simplicity of diet and of dress, and good manners and wholesome conversation at the table, important factors in the development of moral and religious character.

He combats strongly the common assumption that comparatively little can be accomplished with respect to the moral and religious education of children until they have learned to speak, and can be given definite instruction concerning God and right. The fact is, on the contrary, "that language itself has no meaning until rudimental impressions are first begotten in the life of experience, to give it a meaning. . . . The word *light* does not signify anything, till the eye has taken the impression of light. The word *love* is unmeaning, to one who has not loved and received love. The word *God* raises no conception of God, till the idea of such a being has been somehow generated and associated with that particular sound."

In the most impressionable years of early childhood, the foundation is being laid for all subsequent instruction and training. "There is great importance, even, in the handling of infancy. If it is unchristian, it will beget unchristian states or impressions. If it is gentle, even, patient, and loving, it prepares a mood and temper like its own. There is scarcely room to doubt that all most crabbed, hateful, resentful, passionate, ill-natured characters; all most even, lovely, firm and true, are prepared, in a great degree, by the handling of the nursery."

"I have no scales to measure quantities of effect in this matter

of early training, but I may be allowed to express my solemn conviction that more, as a general fact, is done, or lost by neglect of doing, on a child's immortality, in the first three years of his life, than in all his years of discipline afterwards. . . . Let every Christian father and mother understand, when their child is three years old, that they have done more than half of all that they will ever do for his character. Let no parent, shifting off his duties to his children, think to have his defects made up, and the consequent damages mended afterwards, when they have come to their maturity, by the comparatively slender, always doubtful, efficacy of preaching and pulpit harangue."

There are strong chapters dealing, in careful detail, with problems of family discipline, family worship, and the Christian teaching of children in the home. In all, the principle followed is the same. It is the Christian life of the parent, his good sense and the completeness of his own devotion to the will of God, as shown him in Christ Jesus, that matters most. Parental government is genuine, and parental authority real, to just the extent that the parents themselves are governed by God, take His purposes for their own, and seek to make the home a dwelling-place of His Spirit. Family prayer is natural, if it brings to conscious expression the aims of the family's everyday living; it is artificial, forced and ineffective, if "it stands alone in the house, and has nothing put in agreement with it." It is easy to teach to children the principles of Christian truth, provided this teaching is but an explanation to them of the motives which actually determine the behavior which they see, and the conditions of life which they share. "You teach Christ not by words only, but by so living as to make your own life the interpreter of his."

It is difficult to summarize detailed counsels on practical matters; and I fear that I have failed to convey any impression of the shrewd insight and wholesome common sense which unite with Christian devotion in these pages. It is remarkable in how many respects Bushnell's dissent from current theories and practices anticipated the development of later days. He opposed what was called "indoctrination," which consisted chiefly in the memorization of dogmatic catechisms, and favored a larger emphasis upon the understanding of Scripture; he advocated the graduation of methods and materials of instruction in Christian truth; he recommended greater freedom in conversation with respect to the objects of religious belief, and more sincerity in answering children's questions and in dealing with adolescent doubts; he believed that the play of children, instead of being a symptom of original sin, is a "divine appointment," of educative value, and "the symbol and interpreter of Christian liberty"; he conceived the goal of education in terms of what he called "the emancipation of the child."

The Christian religion universalizes the relations of family life. Jesus' teachings concerning God as well as concerning human duty, are based upon these relations. God, he tells us, is our Father; and all we are brethren. Our understanding of these teachings depends upon the quality of our own family life. It is the privilege and responsibility of the parent to interpret God to his children in terms of his own character, and so to direct the spirit of his family that it

may fitly serve as the type of all good social living. A family is really Christian which, being established in the Christian convictions of the parents, so expresses these convictions in its spirit and practice that its children may grow up to the children of God. No Christian leader has seen this essential relation between the religion of Jesus and the life of the family, more clearly than Horace Bushnell; and no one has stated it more cogently.

We quoted a letter from a child in illustration of the older theology which Bushnell combatted. In conclusion, let us read a letter from a father to his daughter, in her first year at boarding school. The father is Dr. Bushnell himself; and the letter reveals his own practice of his doctrine.

Hartford, January 17, 1848.

My Dear Child:—You can hardly guess how much we miss you. When our little circle is gathered around the parlor fire at evening, we all take turns in saying—perhaps breaking silence to say—I wish now dear L—— was here. And the children ask, moreover, how long, how many months, will it be before she comes home? And then I see how their souls are stretching and working after the measures of time, contriving in themselves how long a month is, and how long these months will be. Well, it is a blessed thing for them to know the measures of time through their affections—how much better than to learn its measures through expectations of pleasure, appetite, or any selfish good. If we all had our clock in our hearts, measuring off our days by the love we exercise to friends, to mankind and to God, we should make a friend of time also. We should live, in fact, a great while longer in a much shorter time.

I have been greatly pleased, my dear daughter, by the spirit of your letters, because I think that you are earnestly desirous of improvement. I hope, meantime, that you will be turning your thoughts to religion and to God, as well as to your studies. You have been religiously educated, and you are come now to an age when you must begin to be more responsible to yourself. Our prayer for you is, every day, that God would impart his grace to you and draw you on to a full choice of himself, and perform the good work which we trust he has begun in you. This would complete our happiness in you. I would recommend to you now that you set before you, as a distinct object, the preparing yourself to make a profession of the Saviour. Make this a distinct object of thought and of prayer every day. And do not inquire so much what you are, whether truly a Christian in heart or not, as how you may come into the full Christian spirit, to become unselfish, to have a distinct and abiding love to Christ. Unite yourself to Christ for life, and try to receive his beautiful and loving spirit. You will find much darkness in you, but Christ will give you light. Your sins will trouble you, but Christ will take away your sins and give you peace. Pray God, also, to give you his spirit, and do not doubt that his spirit will help you through all difficulties. In all your duties and studies, endeavor to do them for God and so as to please him. Make this, too, your pleasure, for assuredly it will be the highest pleasure. It may not so appear at first but it will be so very soon. Nothing, you will see in a moment, can yield so sweet a pleasure as the love and pursuit

of excellence, especially that excellence which consists in a good and right heart before God. And you will be more likely to love this work and have success in it, if you set before you some fixed object, such as I have proposed.

We gave you to God in your childhood, and now it belongs to you to thank God for the good we have sought to do for you, and try to fulfill our kindness by assuming for yourself what we promised for you. We feel very tenderly towards you, and we know that you love us; and Christ loves us all more than we can love each other. We are a very happy family, and if we are all one together in Christ, it will secure our happiness in all future time. No pleasure will be marred, and no blight will ever come upon the satisfaction we have in each other. May the good spirit of God, my dear child, guide you in your absence from us, be with you daily, and assist you to be wise. May every day be a happy day, because it is passed under the smile of your heavenly Father.

Your loving father,
HORACE BUSHNELL.

Dr. Henry Neumann's "Education for Moral Growth"

Reviewed by GEORGE A. COE

Nowhere in this country, probably, has the practise of moral instruction and training been as carefully thought out, and as specific, continuous, and curriculum-pervading for as many years as at the Ethical Culture School in the City of New York. During these years, many a voice, like that of Palmer, has proclaimed the futility (or worse) of ethical instruction in schools, and the educational reform that bears Dewey's name has seemed to make the pupil's actions his only teacher of morals. Meantime, though the leaders of this school have been quick to listen, they have done thinking and experimenting on their own account, and they have achieved a faith for which they are ready to give reasons. This new work by Dr. Neumann, who is an instructor in ethics and education at the Ethical Culture School, besides being leader of the Brooklyn Society for Ethical Culture, is an exposition of this faith, with illustrations from practise. Fortunately, it does not argue the question of method apart from that of content, and as a consequence we have presented here in natural unity a sketch of an ethical philosophy, a critique of current life and culture, and an analysis of the educative process that is requisite for moral growth.

Philosophically, the work is under the influence of Kant, mediated and modified by Felix Adler. We are members, it is held, of an ideal spiritual order—a real order, not a mere wish-world—whence the ought, or absolute obligation, issues. This spiritual reality is a unitary whole that is partly and imperfectly manifested in the world of persons as we know them. Because of this participation in the perfect whole, and because each of us is capable of increasing this participation, every person has ultimate worth. The basis of the moral life is respect, active respect, for persons; and the supreme and inclusive moral law is that we should reciprocally bring out the best in one another. Whether, in all this, Dr. Neumann has met, or even recognized, the oft-stated difficulties of the Kantian ethical philosophy, or whether he realizes that that the Kantian standpoint is not the only one from which there arises the attribution of ultimate worth to persons, I shall not stop to inquire. For I desire space in which to give a hint of the penetrating and timely critique of present tendencies in society and in education that is made from the standpoint of the ultimate worth of persons. The author examines, first, two of the ethical concepts of democracy—freedom and equality—and then estimates the contributions made to our educational ideals respectively by the Puritan tradition, the spirit of nationalism, classical culture, modern science, the demand for vocational fitness, and the pragmatist criticism.

Freedom, it is pointed out, has ethical quality only when ethical standards are included within it as of its essence—standards of positive good. When freedom is conceived as "doing as one likes as long as one does not interfere with others," it tends to become practical immorality, because it is an invitation to selfishness. Incorporate into it the sacredness of persons, however, and at once we require mutuality in making

*New York: Appleton, 1923. Pp. ix, 383.

decisions, respect for minorities, and mutual action of positive character. In a similar manner, the concept of equality is corrected and enriched. No longer does it point to sameness or equivalence, either quantitative or qualitative, but to the uniqueness and indispensableness of each individual, and to the value of variety. Educationally this means opportunity for uniqueness of training and of growth; socially it means opportunity to make one's unique contribution to the social whole.

The Puritan tradition has gone into our educational ideals as appreciation of law, and as a glorification of self-reliance, grit, and energy. But it is basally individualistic; it represents both God and men as will to power, and will to fight for it; it falsely classifies men into the simply good and the simply bad, and it does not understand right relations among unequals. All this must be corrected by the principle of the ultimate worth of all persons.

This principle is needed, likewise, to clarify, cleanse, and refine the spirit of nationalism. First of all, it makes vivid the difference between mere herd impulse, however intense, and truly ethical love of country. Next, it furnishes standards for estimating the true significance of our national history and our national traits, and finally, it gives us a really ethical approach to current problems, such as race relations. I do not know where one can find in the compass of a single chapter any like amount of timely, penetrating, yet genial insight into the foremost political-ethical problem of the present day. The chapter might well be separately printed and circulated by the million.

Our tradition of classical culture undoubtedly contributes to "decorum, correctness, restraint, and taste." But when we subject it to the same scrutiny that has just been given to our half-grown tradition of freedom and equality, this is what we find: Not only did classical culture get its hold as the prerogative of a ruling class, but it is not inherently adapted to all kinds of talent, nor even to all the learned professions. Moreover, it has helped to keep the "cultured" class too closely wedded to the existing order, and consequently it has failed to provide leaders for changes that need to be made. "Why is it that so much of the business of advocating needed changes is left to the unscholarly agitator, the fellow with a grievance, whose views are too likely to be distorted by the sense of personal wrong? Often one hears things which are true mis-stated or exaggerated out of all proportion by soap-box orators. But when one is about to turn with repugnance from the street agitator, it would be well to ask why so much of the task of quickening the public conscience is left to this type. . . . If the work of helping our stricken world to better human relationships needs, as it does under democracy, the co-operation of all, let us ask ourselves what is lacking in our conception of culture—our 'humanizing' culture—that, with only few exceptions, this tale of aloofness on the part of the cultivated can be told of needed new causes everywhere in our country."

The invaluable contributions made by modern science to democracy and education are, of course, cordially recognized. "The way to salvation is through intelligence." Yet our age does not realize the merely instrumental character of scientific knowledge. The sciences show us, not what ought to be done, but only how anything—good, bad, or indif-

ferent—can or cannot be done. Our final standards are not facts, not things or social conditions as they are or ever were; nor is the method of nature, even where instinctive co-operation occurs, identical with the method of the moral life. The differentiating principle is the sacredness of persons. Education in and through the sciences, then, should be accompanied by—rather suffused with—recognition of ideal ends that outrun all actualities whatsoever.

The chapter on "The Demand for Vocational Fitness" is both insightful and vigorous. The worth of persons is still the controlling principle for education as for conduct generally. "The aim should be to train persons who are to see their work in its relations to the world's essential needs, and whose performance of their function is to help them, and all others influenced by their work, become better persons." Education for leisure as a relief from work is not enough; human living and growth of personality must be found in one's occupation itself. The author is thinking of "workers, in the broadest sense of the term, who will make a beginning even today toward regarding work—as an ethical civilization worthy of the name would regard it—as a leading opportunity to develop human souls. That this conception will require fundamental changes in our economic system goes without saying. There must be a shift from work for profit to work for service. How this will be eventually effected is not our concern here. Our interest is in the need for a changed point of view. The idea to be kept always in the foreground is, "How can work contribute to the making of better personality?" Therefore vocational education should have historical, social and ethical as well as scientifically technical content.

"Everything depends upon the aim"—a remark of Neumann's concerning vocational education—may serve also as a clue to his critique of the influence of pragmatism upon education generally. But "aim" must be understood in the full sense of thoughtful choosing by the pupil in the light of ideal possibilities. Satisfying activity is not necessarily enlightened activity; even when it is fully shared it may not be social in the highest sense. Unless there is an obligatory best, unless there are social "ties of absolute obligation," how can we choose between alternatives all of which may be, upon some basis of appeal, satisfying? Dewey's notion of the end of education as increase of shared experience is interpreted as hedonistic, subjectivistic, and in practise insufficient to weld the strong bonds between persons that alone can make a real and firm democracy.

There follows an argument for "direct" moral instruction, but not as a thing *per se*, rather as a part of full moral action (which must be thinking action) in a group composed of teachers and pupils. The picture of school life that one finds here is not that of a catechism class, or of a moral homily, but that of unusually thoroughgoing self-government, unusual richness of enterprises that are not teacher-imposed, but developed out of situations spontaneously arising. Nor is this pictured school isolated from society, past, present, or future; rather, it is a conscious part of the great society, consciously striving for wide social improvement. Indeed, though Neumann "shies" at the project as a general principle for moral instruction and training, his most vivid and

obviously effective instances are precisely those in which this principle is most obviously in control.

His argument for "direct" instruction, therefore, appears to simmer down to a demand for real thinking on the part of pupils; for recognition by them of the situation, the problem, the data, the tendency of the evidence, including present experiment and present free experimentation. The function of "direct" instruction, the author says, "is to interpret the experiences already known in such a way that the children may be stimulated to undertake still better." "Children do not have to organize their ideas of right and wrong around their understanding of the categorical imperative or the theory of utilitarianism. The main business of the school is to get them to perform concrete acts of right conduct." In the light of this, one wonders whether the opposition to pragmatism and to the project method is very profound, after all. At the risk of doing injustice to a great problem by too great brevity, a hint may be ventured that Neumann might derive everything vital in his educational scheme by carrying forward the teleology, or principle of critical purposing, that is the core of Dewey's theory of experience. Certainly this might be done if, as I believe, the inherent worth of persons could come to recognition upon this basis.

There is scant space in which to mention a whole group of chapters. The "Moral Values in the Various Studies" are sought, not by transforming the curriculum in accordance with Neumann's notion of the functions of living, but by hunting for moral situations within or connected with the present vertical and largely abstract "subjects" of study. The chapter on "Native and Acquired Promptings" gives a list of native endowments that is practically useful, tho it is not psychologically analytic. A short chapter on "The Power of the Feelings" shows how far the author is from mere intellectualism. Under "Religious Education" he argues for frankness on the part of parents with respect to their own religious outlook and for factual instruction with regard to the various religions and religious environments. Of course he opposes instruction that closes the minds of children either for or against any dogma. Further, he holds that, since the main determinant of any vital religion is ethical experience, the great desideratum of religious education is precisely the education for moral growth that the volume describes. The concluding chapter, "The Teacher," finely appreciative of the teacher's calling, shows with great clarity the necessity that the teacher should be something more than an agent for maintaining the *status quo*. There must be room in the profession for different standpoints, and for dissent from current majorities. Here Neumann agrees with Dewey, that the school must be an agent for social reconstruction as well as conservation.

A word may be in order concerning Neumann's treatment of the problem of religious education. By implication he represents religion predominantly in the guise of theological or philosophical beliefs, and correspondingly he ignores worship and the place that it might have in the life of the young. Yet his own conception of the moral experience treats close to the edge of worship—perhaps crosses the edge. For there is for him an ideal, yet real, spiritual world, which is one (not many), whence radiates the light of all our ethical seeing. In every

person we encounter the sacred, in the presence of which we are asked to take off our shoes of conventionality and prudence because we are on holy ground. Here, surely, are roots of the experience of worship, and it would be well worth while to ask whether they could be watered and made to sprout, even in the experience of children, without any dogmatic trellising of the resulting life-shoots. Is it inconceivable that parent and child might have whole-hearted fellowship in worship with no forcing whatever of the child's beliefs?

One closes the book with deep assent to one of its introductory statements—"The gravest problem for school, home and community today is not raised by the relatively small number of criminals. It is raised by the moral unenlightenment of the much larger number of quite respectable persons." To the solution of this problem the work makes not a few noteworthy contributions.

Glendora Foothills School,
Glendora, California,
January 24, 1924.

THE LIBRARY

Among the many functions of the Association is that of keeping up a working library of books, pamphlets and reports on religious education. A most valuable collection has been secured. A considerable space in the offices is devoted to this purpose. Comfortable tables are available to those desiring to consult the books. The volunteers, who are carrying on the executive work of the Association pending the appointment of a General Secretary, have not yet secured an Acting Librarian. There has therefore resulted an accumulation of the most recent books which have not yet been catalogued or reviewed. The patient consideration of authors and publishers is requested.

A review of recent books will appear in an early number of RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

THE CONVENTION

Providence, Rhode Island, April 23-26, 1924

"RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND THE FAMILY"

A vital conference and practical discussion of the significant problems of modern family life. Important papers are printed in this issue and others will appear in the April issue, upon which the discussions will be based.

The Headquarters will be at the Biltmore Hotel. Prices of rooms as follows: Every room has a bath and outside exposure. Single Rooms, \$3.50; \$4.00; \$4.50; \$6.00 and \$7.00 per day. Double rooms with double bed, \$6.00 and \$6.50 per day. Double rooms with twin beds, \$7.50; \$8.00; \$9.00 and \$10.00 per day.

Early reservations should be made.

The sessions of the convention are open to the public. Discussion is limited to members. Full membership privileges with subscription to RELIGIOUS EDUCATION, \$4.00 per year. Send for membership blank to:

The Religious Education Association, 308 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago

HARTFORD W. Douglas Mackenzie President

Theological Seminary

Dean, M. W. Jacobus

School of Religious Pedagogy

Dean, E. H. Knight

Kennedy School of Missions

Dean, E. W. Capen

Through these associated schools Hartford offers full training for:

1. The Christian ministry.
2. The whole field of religious education.
3. The foreign field.

Each School has its independent faculty and its own institutional life, and together they form one interdenominational institution with the unity of common aim and spirit.

HARTFORD SEMINARY FOUNDATION, Hartford, Conn.

STUDY AT HOME

While Teaching

become more efficient through courses in your particular subject whether it be English, Mathematics, History or the Sciences or through professional courses in education like "Genetic Psychology," "Story Telling in Primary Grades," "Elementary School Administration and Supervision," "Methods of Teaching in Elementary Schools," "The Junior High School Movement," "Educational Measurements," etc. The University gives over 450 courses by mail which command credit towards a Bachelor degree. Begin any time.

The University of Chicago
41 Ellis Hall
Chicago, Illinois



WINSTON-INTERNATIONAL RED LETTER BIBLES

SELF-PRONOUNCING

BIBLES and TESTAMENTS that EMPHASIZE CHRIST
All the Prophetic Types and Prophecies in
Old Testament and Words of Christ in
New Testament are Printed in Red.

Send for Illustrated Catalog

THE JOHN C. WINSTON CO., Publishers
American Bible Headquarters
279 WINSTON BUILDING PHILADELPHIA

This is the time to read

The New Testament

An American Translation

By Edgar J. Goodspeed

In translating the New Testament into the language of today Dr. Goodspeed has not sought to supplant the King James version, nor to replace its beautiful phrases with the slang of a rushing twentieth century America. He has tried merely to make the Bible passages as easily understood by us all as they were by the common folk of ancient Greece. He has utilized the best of our modern scholarship to bring out the original meaning of the New Testament in a dignified and reverent way.

Regular Edition: postpaid, cloth, \$3.12; leather \$4.12; morocco \$5.12

Pocket Edition (India paper): postpaid, cloth \$2.62; leather \$3.62; morocco \$4.62

The Story of the New Testament

By Edgar J. Goodspeed

In a popular narrative manner Dr. Goodspeed here tells how each book or letter in the New Testament came to be written and how each sought to meet the special situation in early Christian life to which it was addressed. All readers of the **American Translation** will turn with interest to this answer to the questions, "Who wrote the New Testament, and when and where and how?"

\$1.50, postpaid \$1.60

Let us
send you
our latest
bulletin
"About
Religious
Books"

Paul, Son of Kish

By Lyman I. Henry. **\$1.90 and \$2.50 net**

Epochs in Buddhist History

By Kenneth J. Saunders. **\$3.00, postpaid \$3.10**

The Rise of Christianity

By Frederick Owen Norton. **\$2.00, postpaid \$2.10**

The Social Origins of Christianity

By Shirley Jackson Case. **\$2.50, postpaid \$2.60**

Law and Freedom in the School

By George A. Coe **\$1.75, postpaid \$1.85**

The University of Chicago Press

5810 Ellis Avenue

Chicago, Illinois

